HARVARD UKRAINIAN STUDIES

Volume V Number 2 June 1981

Ukrainian Research Institute
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

ISSN 0363-5570

Published by the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University,
Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

Printed by the Harvard University Printing Office
Typography by Brevis Press, Cheshire, Conn.

CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTORS

Alan Fisher is professor of history at Michigan State University.

George G. Grabowicz is associate professor of Slavic languages and literatures at Harvard University.

Patricia Kennedy Grimsted is a research associate at the Ukrainian Research Institute and the Russian Research Center of Harvard University.

Robert Mathiesen is associate professor of Slavic languages at Brown University.

Edward Kasinec is librarian for Slavic collections at the University of California, Berkeley.

Ivan L. Rudnytsky is professor of history at the University of Alberta, Edmonton.

The Ottoman Crimea in the Sixteenth Century

ALAN FISHER

In the last century a great deal has been written about the Crimea, the Crimean Khanate, and the Tatars who lived there. Especially since their deportation in 1944 and the subsequent assignment of the Crimean peninsula to the Ukrainian SSR, the number of publications related to the Crimea and the Tatars has increased.[1] Quantity in this case, however, has not brought about improved quality, and our knowledge about the Crimea has not markedly gained.

For Soviet writers (and some Western scholars) the Tatar population of the Crimea has been eliminated in all but a very negative sense. Until the Crimea's annexation, they tell us, the peninsula harbored only bandits, slave traders, and northern Ottoman Turkish outposts against the Slavic states on its borders. After the beginning of the nineteenth century, the "rightful" owners of Crimean lands regained control. Eventually, in 1944, the last of the "bandits" were removed.[2]

During the three centuries before its annexation in 1783, the Crimean peninsula harbored the Crimean Tatar Khanate, a "pre-feudal" state incorporating holdovers from the Tatar-Mongol hordes. The khanate was an instrument of Ottoman Turkish aggression against Slavic populations in Poland, the Ukraine, and Muscovite Russia. It was a place where Polish, Ukrainian, and Muscovite captives were sold as slaves. The city of Kefe (Kaffa) is represented in the same way that M. Litvin described it in the sixteenth century, as "the monster which drinks our blood."[3]

Such generalizations, and the revulsion towards a people that resulted from them, have led scholars to avoid asking some important questions

[1] For a bibliography of works on these subjects, see A. W. Fisher, *The Crimean Tatars* (Stanford, 1978), pp. 231–55.

[2] See, for example, P. N. Nadinskii, *Ocherki po istorii Kryma,* vol. 1 (Symferopil', 1951), and vol. 2 (Symferopil', 1957); I. Chirva, *Ocherki po istorii Kryma,* vol. 3 (Symferopil', 1964), and vol. 4 (Symferopil', 1967); and V. Al'tman, "Sessiia po istorii Kryma," *Voprosy istorii,* 1948, no. 2, pp. 179–84, for expositions of these views.

[3] "Izvlechenie iz sochineniia Mikhaila Litvina, 1550 g.," in *Memuary otnosiashchiesia k istorii Iuzhnoi Rusi,* vol. 1 (Kiev, 1890), pp. 4–38.

about this region. Yet answering these questions could well yield important new information not only about the Crimea, but also about East European history in general. For example, we know very little about the khanate itself, its relations with the Ottomans, its degree of sovereignty, or the internal functioning of its society or government.[4]

The following questions must be answered to understand the history of the Crimea: (1) What was the role of the Ottoman government there and how was it established? (2) What lands did the Ottomans control and what relationship did these lands have to those controlled by the Tatars? (3) What was the nature of the Crimean economy in both its Ottoman and Tatar portions, and what were the connections between the two? (4) In its "special relationship" with the Giray dynasty, how did the Ottoman government view its own portion of the Crimean peninsula, that belonging to the Tatars, and the Crimea as a whole? (5) What officials did the Ottomans maintain in the Crimea, and what were their responsibilities? (6) How did relations between the Ottomans and Poland, Muscovy, and the Ukraine involve the Crimea?

Since none of these questions has been answered satisfactorily, and most have not even been posed in historical literature, factual knowledge about the Crimean peninsula and its Tatar and Ottoman districts is at a very primitive stage. In fact, we do not know for certain where the boundary between the two districts lay, nor how it was established and changed over time. An enormous confusion exists about the Ottoman "control" of the Crimea and the khanate. Kefe is often spoken of as a Tatar rather than Ottoman city; the slave markets are usually considered part of the Crimean Tatar rather than Ottoman economy. Indeed, at some times the Tatars are described as vassals and at others, as subjects of the Ottoman sultans: which description more closely approximates reality? Were the Tatars Ottoman subjects, or did they possess the city of Kefe?[5]

The actual conquest of the southern shores of the Crimea by Sultan Mehmed II Fatih in 1475, and the subsequent establishment of relations between the Ottomans and the Crimean Tatar Girays (1475–1478) were

[4] B. Kellner-Heinkele, *Aus den Aufzeichnungen des Said Giray Sultan* (Freiburg, 1975), gives valuable information about the inner structure of the ruling dynasty in the mid-eighteenth century. The recent publication of documents from Topkapi Sarayi on Ottoman-Tatar relations is an important contribution to this subject: A. Bennigsen et al., *Le Khanat de Crimée dans les Archives du Musée du Palais de Topkapi* (Paris and The Hague, 1978).

[5] The introduction to Bennigsen, *Le Khanat*, is the best introduction to these relations in print.

well sorted out and presented by Halil Inalcik some time ago.[6] But the Ottomans' organization of the Crimea as an administrative unit and the steps taken to establish Ottoman sovereignty in the realms of administration, law, finance, and the military are still undetermined. A good deal more research in Ottoman archives is required before such problems can be resolved.

Certain preliminary steps, however, may be taken now. In a study in progress (of which this essay is a part) I try to discern the social and economic nature of the Ottoman portion of the Crimea during the middle of the sixteenth century, that is, during the reign of Sultan Suleyman I. This is a prerequisite, I believe, to ascertaining the role of the Ottomans in the Crimea, their relations with the Tatars, and the functions of the Ottoman Crimea within Eastern Europe and the steppe in general.

Such a study requires the use of new and different historical sources, for those used by historians to date have been inadequate in both number and kind. For instance, almost no valuable information on the Crimea can be found in the Polish or Muscovite chronicles. More surprising is that Ottoman and Crimean chronicles give few hints about Ottoman rule in the Crimea from either an administrative or economic perspective, although they do contain some data on military activities.[7] But none of the chronicles give any information about the Crimea's actual role—political, economic, or even military—in larger Ottoman policies.

Relations between the Ottoman government and the Crimean Khanate will surely be studied in the coming years, most likely by the team of scholars headed by A. Bennigsen. A fairly thorough analysis of these relations can, it seems, be done from the documents that survive; however, the khanate's own archives, last studied by F. Lashkov at the end of the nineteenth century, are completely out of circulation somewhere in the USSR or have disappeared.[8]

6 H. Inalcik, "Yeni Vesikalara Göre Kırım Hanlığının Osmanlı Tabiliğine Girmesi ve Ahidname Meselesi," *Belleten* 8 [31] (1944): 185–229.

7 See, for example, V. D. Smirnov, *Krymskoe khanstvo pod verkhovenstvom Otomanskoi porty do nachala XVIII veka* (St. Petersburg, 1887), who thoroughly mined both Ottoman and Tatar chronicles. Published editions of some of the Tatar chronicles include: A. Zajączkowski, ed., *La chronique des steppes kiptchak: Tevarih-i Dešt-i Qipčak* (Warsaw, 1966); O. Górka and Z. Wójcik, eds., Kirimli Haci Mehmed Senai, *Historia Chana Islam Gereja III* (Warsaw, 1971); Seiid Mukhammed Riza, *Asseb o Sseiiar' ili Sem' Planet'* (Kazan, 1832); and O. Gökbilgin, ed., *Tarih-i Sahib Giray Han* (Ankara, 1973).

8 F. F. Lashkov, "Arkhivnyie dannyie o beilikakh v Krymskom khanstve," *Arkheologicheskii s'ezd: Trudy* 6, no. 4 (1889): 96–110; idem, *Pamiatniki diplomaticheskikh*

Fortunately for the study of the Ottoman Crimea, thousands of large registers and individual documents have been preserved in the archives of Istanbul. In addition to those registers dealing with Ottoman policy in general (the Mühimme defters, or minutes of the Imperial Council), there are more than 700 registers containing information about financial and administrative affairs in the Crimea. These include registers of endowed pious foundations; registers listing tax liabilities, payments, and arrears; registers containing copies of orders, patents, privileges, and ordinances sent to various officials in Kefe province; lists of tax farms and revenues anticipated from them; bookkeeping accounts and day-books of current financial transactions; records of military expenses, etc.[9] The registers contain information crucial to an understanding of the Ottoman role in the Crimea, and their study should culminate in a rewriting of the region's history.

The most valuable Ottoman sources on the Crimea for this period, however, are two censuses taken of the Ottoman province in the first half of the sixteenth century. The first, from ca. 1529, is a "detailed" census, listing all heads of household grouped according to quarters in a city or by villages in the various districts. It also details the tax liabilities for each group according to goods produced or services performed.[10] The second census, from ca. 1545, is a "summary" census, listing only totals of heads of households, without individual names, for each quarter or village. Their tax liabilities are given as totals, without itemization.[11] Both censuses contain local "law codes" (*kanun names*) specifying tax

---

snoshenii Krymskogo khanstva s moskovskim gosudarstvom v XVI i XVII vv. (Symferopil', 1891); idem, "Sbornik dokumentov po istorii krymsko-tatarskogo zemlevladeniia," *Izvestiia Tavricheskoi uchennoi arkhivnoi kommissii* 26 (1897): 24-154.

9 I have published a guide to those registers dealing with the Crimea in "Ottoman Sources for a Study of Kefe Vilayet: The *Maliyeden Müdevver* Fond in the Başbakanlık Arşivi in Istanbul," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 19, no. 1/2 (1978): 191-205.

10 Istanbul, Başbakanlık Arşivi, Tapu ve Tahrir (hereafter T. ve T.) defter no. 370. Two recent studies examine some aspects of Ottoman administration in the Crimea. Mihnea Berindei and Gilles Veinstein, "La présence ottomane au sud de la Crimée et en Mer d'Azov dans la première moitié du XVI^{e} siècle," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 20, no. 3/4 (1979): 389-465; and I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, M. Berindei, G. Veinstein, "La Crimée ottomane et l'institution du timar," *Annali* 39 (1979): 523-562. A third study has just appeared: G. Veinstein, "La population du sud de la Crimée au debut de la domination ottomane," in *Mélanges en honneur de Ö. L. Barkan* (Aix-en-Provence, 1980).

11 Istanbul, Başbakanlık Arşivi, T. ve T. defter no. 214.

rates applicable in the province of Kefe for the period of the census.[12]

In both censuses, following normal Ottoman practice, the religious communities to which individuals belonged are identified, and in the "detailed" census, the marital status of the heads of household is also given, i.e., married, bachelor, and, for the non-Muslims, widowed. It is thus possible, once a decision about the "average" size of households is made, to estimate the total population of each quarter and village, the total population of Muslims and non-Muslims, and the direction of any population change.

The "law codes" for the province provide us with much information about the economic life of Kefe and the towns dependent upon it. We see that, far from depending solely upon the slave trade, the province of Kefe enjoyed a relatively normal economic life for the time. All sorts of agricultural produce, fish and meat, small artisan industries, as well as slave trading, constituted the major portion of the Kefe economy. Also, the economy of the region was closely dependent on neighboring lands to the north and the Ottoman center in the south.[13]

But the *Kanun names* give only economic expectations from tax rates levied on various types of activity. In order to make sense of this data, one needs to know how much production actually took place. The censuses themselves provide this information. First, they give the taxes (in akçes) levied on the province as a whole (see appendix 1, p. 143). One notes that the tax on the purchase and sale of slaves amounts to 650,000 akçes for the year, or about 24 percent of the total of 2,759,499 akçes levied on the province for all activities. Other port-related activities (exports and imports) account for 1,365,000 akçes, or 50 percent.

All of these taxes were levied primarily on commerce and were distinguished from the taxes on the individual population. The census for ca. 1529 indicates that the taxes on the population of the city of Kefe amounted to 71,111 akçes, the bulk of which was the 52,000 akçes of the capitation tax levied on non-Muslim heads of households (*ispence*).

12 The *Kanun name* from T. ve T. no. 214 is published and analyzed by M. Berindei and G. Veinstein, "Règlements de Süleyman I[er] concernant le liva de Kefe," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 16 (1975): 57–104.

13 Excellent descriptions of the economy, as evidenced in the *Kanun names*, are provided in Berindei and Veinstein, "Règlements," and in M. Berindei and G. Veinstein, "La Tana-Azaq de la présence Italienne à l'emprise Ottomane (fin XIII[e]–milieu XVI[e] siècle)," *Turcica* 8, no. 2 (1976): 110–201.

Tithes on the production of various grains constituted the primary source of revenue from all of the other Crimean cities and towns in both censuses. It is interesting to note that the tithe on grape juice production (for both şorbet and wine) in the city of Soğudak was more than 50 percent of the taxes on that city. These data show that all of the Crimean towns participated in the very diverse economy, producing all sorts of agricultural goods.

A final type of information contained in the censuses, and perhaps the most interesting, is that of the size and shape of the province's population. In addition, from their data one can identify with relative certainty the boundaries between the Ottoman province and the Tatar khanate. It is unusual to find two Ottoman censuses from periods of time so close together; normally they were conducted only every thirty years. Perhaps Ottoman officials had noted a change in the population which effected tax revenues, and the censuses were held to determine what new human resources could be taxed.

For our purposes, five points about the population data in the censuses are relevant. First, between 1529 and 1545 the total population of the province grew by approximately 11 percent. This rise was in line with that experienced elsewhere in the Ottoman Empire, and with a general population increase in the entire Mediterranean world in the first half of the sixteenth century.[14] Not all sections of the province experienced this increase, however. The city of Kefe, which grew by 12 percent, accounted for more than half of the total increase. The cities to the west of Kefe all declined: Soğudak by 15 percent, Mankup by 45 percent, Baliklağu by 13 percent, and Inkirman by 6 percent. Villages in the district of Soğudak, on the other hand, increased by 5 percent, whereas villages in Mankup district declined by 9 percent (see appendix 2, pp. 146–67). One can thus assume that the population was moving gradually eastward, towards the province's capital and into the capital itself.

Secondly, it is clear that there was a very large increase in the population of the districts to the east of Kefe: Kerş (Kerch) grew by 86 percent, Taman' by 732 percent, and Azak by 70 percent. The province had been conquered only sixty years before the first of these censuses was conducted, and it seems apparent that the three eastern districts were late in being populated by the Ottomans. Kerş and Taman' had been only small

[14] See F. Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World*, 2 vols. (New York, 1973), for evidence of the general rise.

villages prior to the conquest, while Azak gained importance when it became the northeastern outpost of Ottoman rule against Muscovy.

Thirdly, as the population grew its religious makeup changed. The rapid rise in Muslims (+89 percent), along with declines in Greek Orthodox Christians (-6 percent), Armenian Christians (-21 percent), and Jews (-11 percent), raises interesting questions about Ottoman religious policy. In the first years after the Ottoman conquest there is evidence of a conscious Ottoman policy of population administration—encouragement of Muslim movement to the Crimea and the transport of Crimean Christians southward and particularly to Istanbul—but in the second quarter of the sixteenth century this was no longer true. All the available evidence indicates that the Muslim population was rising at a much faster rate than that of the non-Muslims during the entire sixteenth century and throughout the empire.

Many Ottoman historians now believe that this change occurred through a policy of religious conversion, not actual movement of population. An excellent study of the city of Trabzon for the same period shows how the process of conversion to Islam worked.[15] As there is no indication of a policy of *forced* conversion (in fact, in the sixteenth century the Ottomans found conversion to Islam an inconvenience because Muslims paid fewer and lighter taxes than did non-Muslims), one can presume that economic and social pressures combined to make conversion attractive.

Fourth, the Ottoman censuses identify the Ukrainian inhabitants (called *Rusyan* in Ottoman) that were subject to the sultan, and thus subject to Ottoman taxation. In 1529, approximately 170 Ukrainians lived in Kefe and 105 in Azak. By 1545 these numbers dropped to approximately 147 in Kefe and none in Azak. Since none of the Ukrainians are identified by place of origin in the censuses, it is likely that they were all from families living in Kefe and Azak at the time of the Ottoman conquest in the late fifteenth century. (Those Jews who recently emigrated into the province from outside the empire are identified—as *Efrenciyan,* from Western Europe, or as *Çerkess,* from Circassia.)

Finally, in the "detailed" census of 1529, slaves owned by non-Muslims are listed under each quarter and village. Their numbers were not large, but of interest is that all three major non-Muslim categories owned slaves, most of them residing in Soğudak and Kefe. Slaves owned by Muslims

[15] Heath Lowry, "The Ottoman *Tahrir Defter*s as a Source for Urban Demographic History: The Case Study of Trabzon (ca. 1486-1583)" (Ph.D. diss., University of California at Los Angeles, 1977).

were not included in the census because they were not taxable. About half of the slaves are identified as *Rus'* (Ukrainian) or *Moskoflu* (Russian), and the other half as Circassian.[16]

The censuses show that the Ottoman Crimea was administered as a normal Ottoman province. While the slave trade was important and did provide substantial revenue for the Ottomans, other forms of economic activity appear to have been more significant from a tax perspective. The province was larger than has been suspected, and included towns and villages well north of the coastal mountains, particularly in the west. Indeed, as the map shows, Ottomans administered villages very close to the Tatar capital of Bahçesaray (Baxčysaraj). The population was heavily non-Muslim, except in Kefe city. But during the periods of the two censuses, Muslims gained considerable ground, so that by mid-century they constituted approximately 35 percent of the total population (in ca. 1529 they made up only 20 percent).

Before a more detailed picture of Kefe province can be presented, many more of the Ottoman registers for the province need to be examined. For example, the nature of the Ottoman administration there, the officials and their responsibilities, remains obscure. Relations with the Tatars north of the frontier are also unclear; for the investigation of this subject, one can only hope that the khanate's archives will reappear. What is clear already, however, is that our overly simplistic notions of the nature of the Crimea either as a Tatar "nest" or as simply an Ottoman military outpost must be revised.

Michigan State University

[16] This is in line with the origin of most slaves sold in Kefe. See my article, "The Sale of Slaves in the Ottoman Empire: Markets and State Taxes on Slave Sales, Some Preliminary Considerations," *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi* 6 (1978): 149–74.

APPENDIX 1

Tax Assessments

I. From the Census of 1529 (T. ve T. 370)

	akçes
A. Taxes levied on the entire province and let out as tax farms (*mukataa*)	
1. fines, bride tax, fees for *muhtesib** of markets and guilds, miscellaneous taxes	58,000
2. bride tax (on the quarter of the city of Kefe called *kale-i hakk*)	24,000
3. customs tax at the port of Kefe city	620,000
4. import tax on wine (in Kefe and Kerş cities)	280,000
5. fees levied in the grand bazaar in Kefe	300,000
6. tax on slave purchases and sales	650,000
7. taxes on guilds, miscellaneous fines and fees, tax on bazaar shops	100,000
8. tax on imports through the "Tatar Gate"	150,000
9. tax on market sales of beef in the Kefe bazaar	10,000
10. tax on *çakma* (beaten metal?) in Kefe	7,000
11. tax on sale of cloth in Kefe (Tuta-i hamr?)	100,000
12. tax on measuring and weighing cloth in the market in Kefe	10,000
13. taxes and fees for the public scales in Kefe	5,000
14. taxes and fees on the "Başhane," market for the sale of sheep heads	17,000
15. tax on the fees of hawkers in the Kefe markets	40,000
16. fees for the market inspectors of Kefe	60,000
17. tax farm on non-Muslim head tax for Kefe	7,000
18. tax on wine entering port of Kefe	15,000
19. confiscation of testamentary estates without heirs, and taxes on escaped slaves	50,000
20. tax from rents of shops in Kefe	120,000
21. income from fees of market hawkers	4,000
22. miscellaneous fees	5,000
23. tax farm on rentals of government property in Kefe	1,500
24. tax farm on head tax levied on Christian Circassians living in Otuzlu	3,000
25. tax farm on the *kale-i hakk*	20,000
26. tax farm on fishermen	100,000
27. taxes on road use	2,999
Totals	2,759,499

* superintendent of police who has charge of examining weights, measures, provisions, etc.

B. Taxes on the population of the city of Kefe		
1. head tax on non-Muslims		52,775
2. police fees (*ihtisab*)		5,450
3. tithes (on various grains)		3,600
4. vineyards (in Muslim hands)		600
5. vegetable gardens and orchards		270
6. tax on sheep		3,377
7. mills		1,292
8. fines, inheritance fees, etc.		2,412
9. fees collected by kadı, kethuda, ağa-i azeb		1,405
	Totals	71,111
C. Taxes on the population of the city of Soğudak		
1. head tax on non-Muslims		7,725
2. police fees		275
3. tithes (on various grains)		31,878
4. vegetable gardens and orchards		825
5. tax on sheep		2,190
6. tax on swine, hay, and flax		3,043
7. mills		512
8. taxes on marriages, firewood and occasional taxes (*bad-i hava*)		3,500
9. vineyards (in Muslim lands)		3,798
10. market dues		1,000
11. tax on falcon nests and wasteland		600
	Totals	55,346
D. Taxes on the population of the city of Mankup		
1. head tax on non-Muslims		3,375
2. taxes on fermented beverages		1,110
3. tithes (on various grains)		1,200
4. tax on flax, hives, hay, fruit, etc.		950
5. market dues and vegetable garden tax		270
6. tax on wine		150
7. sheep tax		25
8. vineyards (in Muslim hands)		7
9. fines, bride tax		768
10. taxes on bathhouses		120
	Totals	7,975
E. Taxes on the population of the city of Balıklağu		
1. head tax on non-Muslims		3,925

2. tithes on grains	460
3. taxes on fermented beverages	2,700
4. tax on flax, fruit, etc.	315
5. sheep tax	1,000
6. fines, bride tax	1,250
7. market dues and taxes	1,000
8. vineyards (in Muslim hands)	388
Totals	11,038
F. Taxes on the population of the city of Inkirman	
1. head tax on non-Muslims	5,325
2. tithes on grains	10,755
3. tax on fermented beverages	8,400
4. vineyards (in Muslim hands)	666
5. tax on flax, hives, vegetable gardens	2,106
6. sheep tax	2,240
7. tax on open fields	50
8. market dues	500
9. fines, bride tax	1,564
Totals	31,606
G. Taxes on the city and district of Kerş	70,000
H. Taxes on the city and district of Taman	95,000
I. Taxes on the city and district of Azak (inns and shops)	23,155
J. Income from the state fish monopoly in Azak	250,000
K. Taxes on imports and exports in Azak	80,000

II. From the Census of 1545 (T. ve T. 214)

	akçes
A. Taxes on the population of the city of Soğudak	
1. head tax on non-Muslims	7,725
2. tithe on wheat	600
3. tithe on barley	80
4. tithe on grape juice	23,960
5. vineyards (in non-Muslim hands)	50
6. orchards	458
7. tax on hives	190
8. tax on swine	175
9. tax on flax	1,900
10. tax on hillsides	900
11. sheep tax	1,900
12. tax on mills	812

13. vineyards (in Muslim hands)		3,990
14. tax on open fields		291
	Totals	43,031

B. Taxes from villages in the district of Soğudak

village	*79*	*80*	*81*	*82*	*83*	*84*	*85*	*86*	*87*	*88*
head tax	220	550	375	1000	175	450	300	1750	850	1825
wheat	49	29	60	300	150	349	177	324	259	262
barley	12	3	3	24	40	49	20	52	40	20
grape juice	49	126	230	240		780	267	1790	2577	1405
vegetables	32		2			50	4	3		62
hives	2		2	177		53	367	64		
çift—tax on Muslim farmers	20					24		49	24	
mills	32						21		11	64
vineyards (Muslim)	240		89			32	50	160	260	251
landless	25		114	120	50	64	290	152	191	357
sheep	37	2240	450	360		509		853		743
orchards			6	12	30	3	1	63	141	49
vineyards (non-Muslim)				73		5	2	12	17	50
flax				50	91	382	727		78	32
swine						91	5	4	39	9
hillsides				11					25	506
open fields						4	27			

APPENDIX 2
Population

I. From the Census of 1529 (T. ve T. 370)

A. City and district of Kefe (Muslims)	*Hane*	*Müc.*	*Bive*	*Total*
a. section of city of Kefe called Frenk Hisar				
1. quarter of small mosque of Bozuca Reis	10	4	—	50
2. quarter of small mosque of Hace Çanak	20	10	—	100
3. quarter of small mosque of Hace Şa'ban	3	—	—	15
4. quarter of small mosque of Mevzala	12	2	—	60

5. quarter of small mosque of Eymeni Mehmed	26	2	—	130
6. quarter of small mosque of Haci Güver	23	6	—	115
7. quarter of small mosque of Milat	—	—	—	—
8. quarter of small mosque of Çineli	35	7	—	175
9. quarter of small mosque of Mercan Ağa	61	2	—	305
10. quarter of the large mosque of Haci Yani	—	—	—	—
b. section of city of Kefe called Kale-i Birun				
11. quarter of small mosque of Halil Bekçi	23	12	—	115
12. quarter of small mosque of Vaiz Sinan	16	6	—	80
13. quarter of small mosque of Hace Hasan	31	7	—	155
14. quarter of small mosque of Sinan Ağa	31	2	—	155
15. quarter of the large mosque (cami-i kebir)	24	8	—	120
16. quarter of the new mosque "Gölbaşı"	29	7	—	145
17. quarter of the small mosque Hatuniye-ı merhum Müftü Veli der merhum şerif Sultan Mehmed	55	11	—	270
18. quarter of small mosque of Seyyid Yalçın	15	1	—	75
19. quarter of small mosque of Hace Vahi	34	6	—	170
20. quarter of small mosque of Mehmed Serdar	32	2	—	160
21. quarter of small mosque of Ferhad Ağa	39	4	—	195
22. quarter of small mosque of Akbaşı	28	3	—	140
23. quarter of small mosque of Seyyid Şırvani	22	1	—	110

24. quarter of small mosque of Çat Çat, formerly called Ayos Bekçibi	15	2	—	75
25. quarter of small mosque of Hoca Hasan	3	1	—	15
28. quarter of small mosque Hayreddin	15	2	—	75
c. section of city of Kefe called Kale-i Hakk				
32. quarter of small mosque of Ahmed	16	1	—	80
33. quarter of small mosque of Hayak Ağa	19	12	—	95
34. quarter of small mosque of Mengli Hafiz	20	4	—	100
36. quarter of small mosque Kahya Sinan Fakir	17	2	—	85
37. quarter of large mosque of Bosna	28	8	—	140
38. quarter of small mosque of Haci Idris	51	3	—	255
40. quarter of the Circassians residing in village of Baybuga near Kefe	12	2	—	60
41. quarter of Tatars residing at Sarı Gül near Kefe	7	1	—	35
42. quarter of small mosque of ?	13	—	—	65
43. quarter of small mosque of Seyyid Ilyas	2	—	—	10
50. quarter of small mosque of Ahmed Efendi	10	20	—	50
B. City and district of Kefe (non-Muslims)				
51. quarter of St. Thoros (Greek)	67	10	6	359
52. quarter of St. Thoros (Armenian)	95	7	16	539
53. quarter of St. Sarkis (Greek)	51	—	7	283
54. quarter of St. Sarkis (Armenian)	73	3	25	465
55. quarter of St. Minkinar (Greek)	157	3	18	857
56. quarter of St. Minkinar (Armenian)	34	4	5	190
57. quarter of St. Iskender (Greek)	25	3	2	133

58. quarter of St. Iskender (Armenian)	108	3	12	588
59. quarter of St. Karapet (Greek)	28	1	3	152
60. quarter of St. Karapet (Armenian)	94	7	21	554
61. quarter of Taş Taban (Greek)	22	2	4	130
62. quarter of Taş Taban (Armenian)	84	5	12	488
63. quarter of Gürcü Kabak (Armenian)	120	7	31	724
64. quarter of St. Ioanna (Armenian)	115	5	13	627
65. quarter of Aş Beğ (Greek)	20	4	3	112
66. quarter of Aş Beğ (Armenian)	134	9	18	742
67. quarter of Balıkçı (Greek)	61	—	19	381
68. quarter of Balıkçı (Armenian)	69	3	6	369
69. community of Gayri yüzbaşı in the Frenk Hisar (Jew)	58	4	9	326
70. quarter of St. Kirikor (Armenian)	134	9	22	758
71. quarter of St. Kaşot (Armenian)	176	9	22	968
72. quarter of St. Hreştakapet (Armenian)	102	3	7	538
73. community of Circassians "penah"	—	—	—	—
74. community of Rusyan	34	1	—	170
75. community of Ishak yüzbaşı (Jewish)	81	1	9	450
77. community of Jews "Efrenciyan"	11	—	—	55
78. community of Circassians residing at Otuzlu	11	—	1	59
C. Villages in the district of Soğudak				
79. Kutlak				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	7	—	—	35
80. Taşlu				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	21	—	3	117

81. Tokluk				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	17	—	2	93
82. Aya Yudin (?)				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	25	—	4	166
83. Arpadi				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	10	—	1	54
84. Kozlu				
Muslim	2	—	—	10
Greek	12	—	2	68
85. Şuma				
Muslim	1	—	—	5
Greek	24	—	3	132
86. Kopsel				
Muslim	2	—	—	10
Greek	51	—	4	271
87. Vorin				
Muslim	2	—	—	10
Greek	23	—	1	119
88. Kapsikhor				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	56	—	3	292
89. Uskut				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	56	—	3	292
107. Monastir				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	42	—	4	226
108. Kuru Özen				
Muslim	1	—	—	5
Greek	76	—	7	408
109. Ulu Özen				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	45	—	4	241
110. Demirci				
Muslim	6	—	—	30
Greek	56	—	10	320
111. Korbaklu				
Muslim	2	—	—	10
Greek	31	—	5	175
112. Kücük Özen				

Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	9	—	—	45
113. Aluşta				
Muslim	9	3	—	45
Greek	128	—	13	692
Jew	20	—	2	108
D. City of Soğudak				
90. Muslims living in quarter of small mosque of Sinan	23	9	—	115
91. quarter of St. Dayalaya (Greek)	6	—	—	30
92. quarter of St. Mihail (Greek)	5	3	—	25
93. quarter of St. Agap (Greek)	9	—	—	45
94. quarter of St. Filiban (Greek)	2	1	—	10
95. quarter of St. Todor (Greek)	10	—	—	50
96. quarter of St. Nikovla (Greek)	20	2	—	100
97. quarter of St. ? (Greek)	25	—	—	125
98. quarter of St. Yakoş (Greek)	36	6	—	180
99. quarter of St. Danoş (Greek)	15	4	—	75
100. quarter of St. Nike (Greek)	33	12	—	165
101. quarter of St. Nikola (Greek)	11	—	2	63
102. quarter of St. Andre (Greek)	27	—	1	139
103. quarter of Fodola Beğ (Greek)	33	—	—	165
104. quarter of Kostandin (Greek)	31	—	3	167
105. quarter of St. Yorgi (Greek)	15	—	3	87
106. community of Armenians in Soğudak	27	—	—	135
106a. community of Jews in Soğudak	2	—	—	10
E. City of Mankup				
116. quarter of the camii-i şerif (Muslim)	10	7	—	50
117. quarter of small mosque of kaçanma (Muslim)	11	2	—	55
118. quarter of small mosque of Hace Seyyid (Muslim)	7	2	—	35
119. community of Jews in Mankup	48	—	3	252
126. community of Greeks in Mankup	80	—	15	460
127. community of Armenians in Mankup	8	—	—	40

F. City of Balıklağu				
154. quarter of mosque outside the fort (Muslim)	24	4	—	120
156. quarter of St. Minkuban (Greek)	54	—	10	310
157. quarter of St. Mitineris (Greek)	30	—	2	168
158. quarter of St. Nikola (Greek)	19	—	3	107
159. quarter of St. Yani (Greek)	10	—	1	54
160. quarter of St. Mihail (Greek)	11	—	2	63
161. community of Armenians	14	—	3	82
162. community of Jews	15	—	1	79
G. City of Inkirman				
176. quarter of small mosque of the fort in the suburb (Muslim)	35	4	—	175
177. quarter of St. Filiban (Greek)	38	4	—	190
178. quarter of St. Fidari (Greek)	9	2	—	45
179. quarter of St. ? (Greek)	17	1	—	85
180. quarter of St. ? (Greek)	32	3	—	160
181. quarter of St. Aşliyanis (Greek)	23	—	4	131
182. quarter of St. Mihail (Greek)	48	—	—	240
183. community of Armenians	9	—	—	45
H. Villages in the district of Mankup				
120. Albati				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	15	—	1	79
121. Atim Çağragi				
Muslim	1	1	—	5
Greek	3	—	2	23
122. Kirmancik				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	8	—	—	40
123. Gavri				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	19	—	—	95
124. Süren				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	58	—	5	310
125. Üçe				
Muslim	1	—	—	5
Greek	17	—	2	93

134. Markuri				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	30	—	5	170
135. Yancu				
Muslim	3	—	—	15
Greek	5	—	—	25
136. Kuklus				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	10	1	—	50
137. Bağan (formerly Cömlekçi)				
Muslim	4	1	—	20
Greek	12	—	4	76
138. Kuçük Muskomiye				
Muslim	1	1	—	5
Greek	39	—	—	195
138a. Sotira				
Muslim	7	—	—	35
Greek	15	—	1	79
140. Kılınzı				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	13	—	2	73
141. Kamire				
Muslim	1	1	—	5
Greek	26	—	3	142
142. Hayto				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	51	—	—	255
143. Gevher				
Muslim	16	4	—	84
Greek	38	—	2	198
144. Taş Iskele				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	22	3	—	113
145. Savatika				
Muslim	4	2	—	20
Greek	28	1	—	140
146. Miskhor				
Muslim	1	1	—	5
Greek	64	3	—	320
147. Has Petri				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	33	—	—	165
148. Foros				

Muslim	1	—	—	5
Greek	37	—	2	193
149. Kirano				
Muslim	4	1	—	20
Greek	25	—	2	133
150. Büyük Hisar				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	14	—	3	82
151. Baydar				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	17	—	1	89
163. Çerkeskirman				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	65	—	7	353
164. Bahadur				
Muslim	2	—	—	10
Greek	65	—	3	337
165. Uğri Kusta				
Muslim	1	—	—	5
Greek	46	—	—	234
166. Tuli				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	27	—	4	151
167. Çorgana				
Muslim	6	—	—	30
Greek	25	—	7	153
168. Büyük Muskomia				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	43	—	—	215
169. Limona				
Muslim	2	1	—	10
Greek	22	—	4	130
170. Sembos				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	30	—	—	150
171. Sikite				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	38	—	3	202
184. Koca Salası				
Muslim	1	—	—	5
Greek	82	—	11	454
185. Vikne				
Muslim	—	—	—	—

Greek	48	—	6	264
186. Kipia				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	37	6	—	185
187. Yalta				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	48	—	4	256
188. Dere				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	41	—	3	217
189. Avitka				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	34	—	—	170
190. Marsanda				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	19	—	2	103
191. Gurzuf				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	150	—	2	758
192. Partenit (kırkkullat)				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	114	—	7	598
193. Lambat (Küçük ve büyük)				
Muslim	2	—	—	10
Greek	73	—	2	373
194. Keknos				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	25	—	2	133
I. City of Kerş				
198. quarter of the large mosque "Şerif"				
Muslim	44	3	—	230
200a. non-Muslim community	73	—	—	365
J. Villages in the district of Kerş				
203. Boğuk				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	3	—	—	15
204. Hafiz Ilyas				
Muslim	8	—	—	40
Greek	24	1	—	120
205. Çankazıya				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	20	—	—	100

K. District of Taman				
207. Muslim community in town of Taman: quarter of small mosque of Kasım Paşa	25	3	—	125
218. community of Circassians (Christian)	9	5	—	45
219. community of Greeks	3	—	—	15
L. District of Azak				
220. district of the Venetian fort (Muslim)	35	10	—	175
221. district of the Genoese fort (Muslim)	17	1	—	85
222. community of ? in the *kale-i hakk* (Muslim)	89	4	—	445
223. community of ? in the *kale-i hakk* (Muslim)	22	2	—	110
225. community of Rus' in the Venetian fort	21	—	—	105
226. community of Jani Circassians in the Genoese fort (Orthodox)	17	—	2	93
227. community of fisherman and netters of Azak (Greek)	59	—	—	295
229. mustahfizan of the Genoese fort (Muslim)	66	—	—	330
230. mustahfizan of the Venetian fort (Muslim)	69	—	—	343

II. From the Census of 1545 (T. ve T. 214)

A. City and district of Kefe (Muslims)	*Hane*	*Müc.*	*Bive*	*Total*
a. section of city of Kefe called Frenk Hisar				
1. quarter of small mosque of Bozuca Reis	17	2	—	85
2. quarter of small mosque of Hace Çanak	22	6	—	110
3. quarter of small mosque of Hace Şa'ban	3	—	—	15
4. quarter of small mosque of Mevzala	14	4	—	70
5. quarter of small mosque of Eymeni Mehmed	27	13	—	135

6. quarter of small mosque of Haci Güver	25	6	—	125
7. quarter of small mosque of Milat	3	—	—	15
8. quarter of small mosque of Çineli	63	21	—	315
9. quarter of small mosque of Mercan Ağa	38	8	—	190
10. quarter of large mosque of Haci Yani	8	—	—	40
b. section of city of Kefe called Kale-i Birun				
11. quarter of small mosque of Halil Bekçi	62	16	—	310
12. quarter of small mosque of Vaiz Sinan	21	4	—	105
13. quarter of small mosque of Hace Hasan	49	5	—	245
14. quarter of small mosque of Sinan Ağa	28	5	—	140
15. quarter of large mosque (cami-i kebir)	49	—	—	245
16. quarter of the new mosque "Gölbaşı"	44	29	—	220
17. quarter of the small mosque Hatuniye-i merhum Müftü Veli der merhum Şerif Sultan Mehmed	75	26	—	375
18. quarter of small mosque of Seyyid Yalçın	34	5	—	170
19. quarter of small mosque of Hace Vahi	55	17	—	275
20. quarter of small mosque of Mehmed Serdar	66	22	—	330
21. quarter of small mosque of Ferhad Ağa	72	23	—	360
22. quarter of small mosque of Akbaşı	37	9	—	185
23. quarter of small mosque of Seyyid Şırvani	41	9	—	210
24. quarter of small mosque of Çat Çat, formerly called Ayos Bekçibi	30	4	—	150

25. quarter of small mosque of Hoca Hasan	4	1	—	20
26. community of the famous Mehmed al Din Hisari	—	3	—	3
27. households of small mosque of the above	1	2	—	5
28. quarter of small mosque Hayreddin	34	8	—	170
29. quarter of small mosque of Hızır Zaviye	51	6	—	255
30. quarter of large mosque of Kasım Paşa	80	24	—	400
31. quarter of Demirciyan (formerly Seyyid Mehmed)	15	—	—	75
c. section of city of Kefe called Kale-i Hakk				
32. quarter of small mosque of Ahmed	36	24	—	180
33. quarter of small mosque of Hayak Ağa	44	7	—	220
34. quarter of small mosque of Mengli Hafiz	23	1	—	115
35. quarter of small mosque of Ebu Kemal	74	3	—	370
36. quarter of small mosque of Kahya Sinan Fakir	32	6	—	160
37. quarter of large mosque of Bosna	40	14	—	200
38. quarter of small mosque of Haci Idris	80	16	—	400
39. quarter of small mosque of the fort's gate	5	—	—	25
40. quarter of Circassians residing in village of Baybuga near Kefe	30	3	—	150
41. quarter of Tatars residing at Sarı Gül near Kefe	18	3	—	90
44. quarter of retainers of Sultan Süleyman	16	—	—	80
B. City and district of Kefe (non-Muslims)				
51. quarter of St. Thoros (Greek)	76	13	6	404
52. quarter of St. Thoros (Armenian)	77	16	16	449
53. quarter of St. Sarkis (Greek)	31	—	—	155

54. quarter of St. Sarkis (Armenian)	54	11	9	306
55. quarter of St. Minkinar (Greek)	121	25	31	629
56. quarter of St. Minkinar (Armenian)	28	2	6	164
57. quarter of St. Iskender (Greek)	15	2	—	75
58. quarter of St. Iskender (Armenian)	84	26	16	484
59. quarter of St. Karapet (Greek)	25	4	5	145
60. quarter of St. Karapet (Armenian)	64	18	11	364
61. quarter of Taş Taban (Greek)	12	1	2	68
62. quarter of Taş Taban (Armenian)	46	10	9	266
63. quarter of Gürcü Kabak (Armenian)	87	14	4	451
64. quarter of St. Ioanna (Armenian)	68	10	9	376
65. quarter of Aş Beğ (Greek)	24	5	9	155
66. quarter of Aş Beğ (Armenian)	129	21	9	681
67. quarter of Balıkçı (Greek)	38	9	16	254
68. quarter of Balıkçı (Armenian)	52	10	9	296
69. community of Gayri yüzbaşı in the Frenk Hisar (Jewish)	42	9	15	270
70. quarter of St. Kirikor (Armenian)	127	20	16	699
71. quarter of St. Kaşot (Armenian)	146	43	14	786
72. quarter of St. Hreştakapet (Armenian)	112	18	10	600
73. community of Circassians "penah"	64	—	—	320
74. community of Rusyan	27	1	3	147
75. community of Ishak yüzbaşı (Jewish)	81	27	15	465
76. community of Circassian Jews	3	—	—	15
77. community of Jews "Efrenciyan"	8	40	6	64
C. Villages in the district of Soğudak				
79. Kutlak				
Muslim	4	—	—	20

Greek	9	—	1	49
80. Taşlu				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	19	3	3	107
81. Tokluk				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	13	2	1	69
82. Aya Yudin (?)				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	37	3	3	197
83. Arpadi				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	7	—	—	35
84. Kozlu				
Muslim	2	—	—	10
Greek	9	9	—	45
85. Şuma				
Muslim	1	—	—	5
Greek	15	9	—	75
86. Kopsel				
Muslim	3	—	—	15
Greek	67	6	10	375
87. Vorin				
Muslim	5	—	—	25
Greek	20	14	4	116
88. Kapsikhor				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	38	22	6	214
89. Uskut				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	82	10	3	422
107. Monastir				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	43	25	2	223
108. Kuru Özen				
Muslim	1	—	—	5
Greek	92	25	10	500
109. Ulu Özen				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	53	5	1	269
110. Demirci				
Muslim	5	—	—	25
Greek	44	20	2	230

111. Korbaklu				
Muslim	5	—	—	25
Greek	25	16	4	141
112. Küçük Özen				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	33	16	10	205
113. Aluşta				
Muslim	12	9	—	60
Greek	111	63	10	595
Jew	18	3	—	90
D. City of Soğudak				
90. Muslims living in quarter of small mosque of Sinan	10	3	—	50
91. quarter of St. Dayalaya (Greek)	10	1	1	54
92. quarter of St. Mihail (Greek)	5	2	—	25
93. quarter of St. Agap (Greek)	5	—	—	25
94. quarter of St. Filiban (Greek)	2	—	—	10
95. quarter of St. Todor (Greek)	6	—	1	34
96. quarter of St. Nikovla (Greek)	17	4	2	93
97. quarter of St. ? (Greek)	20	5	3	112
98. quarter of St. Yakoş (Greek)	16	3	4	96
99. quarter of St. Danoş (Greek)	13	3	3	77
100. quarter of St. Nike (Greek)	25	22	8	157
101. quarter of St. Nikola (Greek)	3	3	1	19
102. quarter of St. Andre (Greek)	17	8	5	105
103. quarter of Fodola Beğ (Greek)	46	4	10	270
104. quarter of Kostandin (Greek)	29	9	8	177
105. quarter of St. Yorgi (Greek)	12	2	2	68
106. community of Armenians in Soğudak	14	6	1	74
106a. community of Jews in Soğudak	—	—	—	—
E. City of Mankup				
116. quarter of the camii-i şerif (Muslim)	18	—	—	90
117. quarter of small mosque of Kaçanma (Muslim)	10	—	—	50
118. quarter of small mosque of Hace Seyyid (Muslim)	8	—	—	40
119. community of Jews in Mankup	35	3	—	175

126. community of Greeks in Mankup	13	6	3	77
127. community of Armenians in Mankup	8	—	—	40
F. City of Balıklağu				
152. quarter of the large mosque (Muslim)	6	3	—	30
153. quarter of small Friday mosque (Muslim)	19	—	—	95
155. community of Tatars	6	—	—	30
156. quarter of St. Minkuban (Greek)	45	14	6	249
157. quarter of St. Mitineris (Greek)	19	9	2	103
158. quarter of St. Nikola (Greek)	12	1	2	68
159. quarter of St. Yani (Greek)	9	—	—	45
160. quarter of St. Mihail (Greek)	13	2	—	65
161. community of Armenians	18	2	2	98
162. community of Jews	11	—	—	55
G. City of Inkirman				
174. quarter of Gayri Yani (Muslim)	19	4	—	95
175. quarter of small mosque of ? (Muslim)	21	—	—	105
177. quarter of St. Filiban (Greek)	34	4	—	160
178. quarter of St. Fidari (Greek)	5	—	—	25
179. quarter of St. ? (Greek)	8	—	—	40
180. quarter of St. ? (Greek)	27	2	5	155
181. quarter of St. Aşliyanis (Greek)	20	—	3	112
182. quarter of St. Mihail (Greek)	47	—	3	247
183. community of Armenians	9	—	1	49
H. Villages in the district of Mankup				
120. Apara				
Muslim	5	—	—	25
Greek	8	5	—	40
121. Aṭim Çağbaği				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	1	—	—	5
122. Kirmancik				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	3	—	—	15

123. Gavri				
Muslim	8	—	—	40
Greek	15	8	1	79
124. Süren				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	33	—	5	185
125. Uçe				
Muslim	1	—	—	5
Greek	3	—	3	27
134. Markuri				
Muslim	4	—	—	20
Greek	11	11	1	59
135. Yancu				
Muslim	3	3	—	15
Greek	3	—	—	15
136. Kuklus				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	11	5	—	55
137. Bağan (formerly Cömlekçi)				
Muslim	3	—	—	15
Greek	16	14	3	92
138. Küçük Muskomiye				
Muslim	3	—	—	15
Greek	32	4	9	196
140. Kılınzı				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	12	—	1	64
141. Kamire				
Muslim	4	3	—	20
Greek	22	19	8	161
142. Hayto				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	47	9	5	264
143. Gevher				
Muslim	70	26	—	376
Greek	27	13	—	148
144. Taş Iskele				
Muslim	1	2	—	7
Greek	18	9	1	103
145. Savatika				
Muslim	3	1	—	15
Greek	13	4	1	69

146. Miskhor				
Muslim	5	2	—	10
Greek	46	24	4	246
147. Has Petri				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	11	12	4	71
148. Foros				
Muslim	9	—	—	45
Greek	41	6	3	217
149. Kirano				
Muslim	7	—	—	35
Greek	16	11	1	84
151. Baydar				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	21	5	4	121
163. Çerkeskirman				
Muslim	5	3	—	25
Greek	44	9	—	220
164. Bahadur				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	25	25	4	225
165. Uğri Kusta				
Muslim	6	—	—	30
Greek	45	4	1	229
166. Tuli				
Muslim	1	—	—	5
Greek	29	16	1	149
167. Çorgana				
Muslim	8	4	—	40
Greek	25	6	5	145
168. Büyük Muskomia				
Muslim	1	—	—	5
Greek	30	6	6	174
169. Limona				
Muslim	6	1	—	30
Greek	13	2	2	73
170. Sembos				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	31	4	1	159
171. Sikite				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	49	3	1	249

172. Küçük Sikite				
Muslim	8	—	—	40
Greek	—	—	—	—
184. Koca Salası				
Muslim	7	8	—	35
Greek	50	24	6	274
185. Vikne				
Muslim	2	—	—	10
Greek	72	9	10	400
186. Kipia				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	35	12	5	195
187. Yalta				
Muslim	1	—	—	—
Greek	60	4	2	308
188. Dere				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	39	5	2	203
189. Avitka				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	33	5	2	173
190. Marsanda				
Muslim	—	—	—	—
Greek	14	3	—	70
191. Gurzuf				
Muslim	4	—	—	20
Greek	110	61	18	622
192. Partenit (Kırkkullat)				
Muslim	6	3	—	30
Greek	87	40	4	451
193. Lambat (Küçük ve Büyük)				
Muslim	3	—	—	15
Greek	60	34	9	336
194. Keknos				
Muslim	4	1	—	20
Greek	34	4	3	182
I. City of Kerş				
196. quarter of the large mosque of Sultan Bayezit Veli (Muslim)	50	4	—	254
197. quarter of the large mosque of Hace Sinan (Muslim)	72	9	—	364

200a. non-Muslim community	47	3	—	238
J. Villages in the district of Kerş				
202. Kamış Burun				
Muslim	19	—	—	95
Greek	28	—	—	140
203. Boğuk				
Muslim	4	—	—	20
Greek	45	—	—	225
204. Hafiz Ilyas				
Muslim	18	—	—	90
Greek	11	—	—	55
205. Çankazıya				
Muslim	2	—	—	10
Greek	8	—	—	40
206. ?				
Muslim	16	—	—	80
Greek	—	—	—	—
K. District of Taman				
207. Muslim community in town of Taman; quarter of small mosque of Kasım Paşa	69	—	—	345
208. community of servitors (hizmetkar) of the fort of Taman (Muslim)	16	—	—	80
209. community of Muslims in fort of Temruk	17	—	—	85
210. community of mustahfizan of fort of Taman	3	—	—	15
211. community of cavalry in Taman (Muslim)	11	—	—	55
212. community of Greeks in Taman	103	—	—	515
213. community of Greeks in Temruk	5	—	—	25
214. community of cavalry in Temruk	4	—	—	20
215. community of Christian retainers of the forts of Taman and Temruk	80	—	—	400
L. District of Azak				
220. district of the Venetian fort (Muslim)	118	—	—	590

221. district of the Genoese fort (Muslim)	78	—	—	390
224. community of Tatars in the *kale-i hakk* (Muslim)	170	—	—	850
227. community of fishermen and netters of Azak (Greek)	105	—	—	525
228. community of Greeks in the *kale-i hakk*	10	—	—	50
228a. community of Circassians in the *kale-i hakk* (Orthodox)	47	—	—	235
229. mustahfizan of the Genoese fort (Muslim)	32	—	—	160
229a. mustahfizan of the *kale-i hakk* (Muslim)	18	—	—	90
230. mustahfizan of the Venetian fort (Muslim)	31	—	—	155
230a. community of shopkeepers in the Venetian fort (Muslim)	15	—	—	75
231. ? in Azak	25	—	—	125

III. The Twenty Largest Towns in 1529 and in 1545

1529		*1545*	
1. Kefe	15,461	1. Kefe	17,302
2. Azak	1,983	2. Azak	3,370
3. Soğudak	1,702	3. Soğudak	1,455
4. Inkirman	1,074	4. Inkirman	1,010
5. Balıklağu	987	5. Balıklağu	856
6. Mankup	913	6. Kerş	845
7. Aluşta	845	7. Aluşta	745
8. Gurzuf	758	8. Gurzuf	642
9. Partenit	598	9. Gevher	524
10. Kerş	585	10. Mankup	505
11. Koca Salası	459	11. Kuru Özen	505
12. Kuru Özen	413	12. Partenit	481
13. Lambat	383	13. Uskut	422
14. Çerkeskirman	353	14. Vikne	410
15. Demirci	350	15. Kopsel	390
16. Bahadur	347	16. Lambat	351
17. Miskhor	325	17. Koca Salası	309

18. Süren	310	18. Yalta	308
19. Kapsikhor	292	19. Ulu Özen	269
20. Uskut	292	20. Foros	264

IV. Biggest Percentage Changes in Population, 1529–1545

Increase (+)		Decrease (-)	
1. Kamış Burun	—	1. Büyük Hisar	100%
2. Boğuk	1533%	2. Sotira	100%
3. Küçük Özen	356%	3. Atim Çağraği	82%
4. Kuzlak	97%	4. Üce	67%
5. Gevher	86%	5. Kirmancik	63%
6. Azak	70%	6. Has Petri	57%
7. Vikne	55%	7. Markuri	54%
8. Keknos	52%	8. Çankazıya	50%
9. Uskut	45%	9. Savatika	48%
10. Kerş	44%	10. Mankup	45%
11. Kopsel	37%	11. Şuma	42%
12. Baydar	36%	12. Süren	40%
13. Foros	32%	13. Arpadi	35%
14. Gavri	25%	14. Bahadur	35%
15. Sikite	23%	15. Koca Salası	33%
16. Kamire	23%	16. Marsanda	32%
17. Yalta	20%	17. Çerkeskirman	31%
		18. Kozlu	29%
		19. Demirci	27%
		20. Kapsıkhor	26%

V. Biggest Changes in Population, in Absolute Numbers

Increase		Decrease	
1. Kefe	1,841	1. Mankup	408
2. Azak	1,387	2. Soğudak	247
3. Kerş	260	3. Koca Salası	150
4. Gevher	242	4. Balıklağu	131
5. Kamış Burnu	235	5. Süren	125
6. Boğuk	230	6. Bahadur	122
7. Küçük Özen	160	7. Partenit	117
8. Vikne	146	8. Gurzuf	116
9. Uskut	130	9. Sotira	114
10. Kopsel	109	10. Çerkeskirman	108

VI. Population Changes in the Vilayet, 1529–45 (includes added Muslim widows)*

District	*Total*	*Muslim*	*Greek*	*Armenian*	*Jew*	*Other*
A. & B. Kefe						
1529	15,461	4,477	2,403	7,530	822	229
1545	17,302	8,113	1,986	5,922	814	467
C. Soğudak villages						
1529	3,954	125	3,720	—	108	—
1545	4,145	190	3,865	—	90	—
D. Soğudak						
1529	1,702	119	1,438	135	10	—
1545	1,455	59	1,322	74	—	—
E. Mankup						
1529	913	161	460	40	252	—
1545	505	213	77	40	175	—
F. Balıklağu						
1529	987	134	692	82	79	—
1545	856	173	530	98	55	—
G. Inkirman						
1529	1,074	178	851	45	—	—
1545	1,010	212	749	49	—	—
H. Mankup villages						
1529	8,867	304	8,563	—	—	—
1545	8,037	1,018	7,019	—	—	—
I. Kerş						
1529	585	220	365	—	—	—
1545	845	610	235	—	—	—
J. Kerş villages						
1529	275	40	235	—	—	—
1545	755	295	460	—	—	—

* Since households headed by Muslim widows were not taxed, these were not counted in either census. Households headed by non-Muslim widows were counted, and I have used the multiplier of 4x—a normal household of 5 less 1—for these. To make the figures for Muslim and non-Muslim populations comparable, on this chart I have added households headed by Muslim widows at the same proportion as that for the non-Muslim communities.

K. Taman						
1529	185	125	15	—	—	—
1545	1,540	600	940	—	—	—
L. Azak						
1529	1,983	1,490	295	—	—	—
1545	3,370	2,435	700	—	—	—
Totals						
1529	35,986	7,373	19,038	7,832	1,271	472
1545	39,820	13,918	17,883	6.183	1,134	702

Three Perspectives on the Cossack Past: Gogol', Ševčenko, Kuliš

GEORGE G. GRABOWICZ

There is little doubt that the Cossack past animates Ukrainian Romanticism and provides its most productive theme. Indeed, its impact is also strongly felt beyond the bounds of Ukrainian literature, for it becomes one of the strongest and most ramified common themes of Polish and Russian Romanticism.[1] Beginning with the pre-Romantics, various writers—in Polish literature the so-called Ukrainian School, the Cossacophiles, the conservatives of the "St. Petersburg Coterie," and finally Słowacki, and in Russian literature the Decembrists (above all Ryleev), Puškin, and Gogol' himself—have turned to the events of the Ukrainian Cossack past not only to find a fascinating and colorful subject matter, but also to illustrate the turbulence of history, and, in fact, to better understand their own respective national past. This, of course, is all the more applicable to Ukrainian literature. Here the broad phenomenon of Cossackdom was the subject of purely literary and imaginative concerns, beginning with Metlyns'kyj and Kostomarov, of ethnographic interests (e.g., of Sreznevskij and Maksymovyč), and finally of concerted historical and historiographic work, primarily by Kuliš and Kostomarov. Ultimately, in a complex evolution and synthesis of these various modalities, an understanding and conceptualization of the Cossack past provided the basis for a new Ukrainian national consciousness.

The central role played by Gogol', Ševčenko, and Kuliš in this process, in modern Ukrainian literature, and in Slavic Romanticism as a whole is also unquestionable. All three are preeminent literary artists whose influence, each in its own way, is visible to this day. They all share a common Ukrainian cultural heritage; at the same time, they all leave a profound mark, especially in the case of Gogol', on the broader Russian imperial

1 An extended treatment of this subject, some of the highlights of which are presented in this article, appears in my forthcoming book, *The Ukraine as Myth: A Study of Polish, Russian and Ukrainian Romantic Literature.*

context. They are, to some extent at least, contemporaries, and, in varying degree, they share a common Romantic poetics. Most obviously, each turns, with an almost obsessive fascination, to the same past. And yet, it is the profound differences in their expression of this central interest and in their formulation of a vision of Cossackdom that are the most instructive for the literary critic—and, I would submit, for the student of modern Ukrainian national consciousness.[2]

The differences in "perspective" to which our attention is here directed exist on a deep level, i.e., in the very mode of apprehending and expressing the subject. The level of events, of certain characterizations, of various formal devices, etc., may be common to all three writers, but this is a *surface* level which, for our purposes, is of secondary importance. Rather than dwelling, as is done so frequently (and superficially), on the given writer's evocation of Cossack heroism and patriotism or his literary and historical sources, I will focus on what I take to be more fundamental, that is, the basic nature of his code. For it is only by knowing the code that we can begin to understand the encoded contents.

In terms of such a code, the differences between them are indeed crucial. In the critical tradition, the writings of Gogol', Ševčenko, and Kuliš have at various times been called historical, and all three authors' depictions of the Cossack past have been variously considered examples of historical fiction.[3] I submit, however, that in Gogol' and Ševčenko

[2] The fact that Gogol' wrote in Russian and is generally considered a Russian writer is not, to my mind, an instance of just such a basic difference. This, as I have argued elsewhere ("Toward a History of Ukrainian Literature," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1, no. 4 [December 1977]: 520–23 and passim), does not in and of itself divorce Gogol' from Ukrainian literature. In various periods of its history, Ukrainian literature has been bilingual (relying also on Polish and Russian), and in the first half of the nineteenth century, virtually all Ukrainian writers, including Ševčenko and Kuliš, wrote as much, or even more, in Russian as they did in Ukrainian; this does not make these writings, or these writers, any less a part of Ukrainian literature. At the same time, I am not arguing that the very fact of being born Ukrainian makes Gogol' a Ukrainian writer. The issue is rather that literature—any literature—is a reflection and an emanation of a culture; in Gogol''s case, his writings, especially his "Ukrainian stories, *Večera na xutore bliz Dikan'ki* and *Mirgorod,* are profoundly rooted in Ukrainian culture and its various traditions (and indeed, as critical practice has tended to show, are rather incomprehensible outside that context) and for that reason he should be considered—at the very least in his early writings—a Russian *and* a Ukrainian writer. On the other hand, the given writer's *conscious* formulation of his national identity—in Gogol''s case, his claim of having both a Ukrainian and a Russian soul, his *dvoedušie*—is important, but that is a separate subject.

[3] On Gogol', cf., for example, A. Karpenko, *Narodnye istoki èpičeskogo stilja istoričeskix povestej N. V. Gogolja* (Černivci, 1961), or S. Mašinskij, *Istoričeskaja povest' Gogolja* (Moscow, 1940); on Ševčenko, see M. Marčenko, *Istoryčne mynule ukrajins'koho narodu v tvorčosti T. H. Ševčenka* (Kiev, 1957), Ju. Margolis, *Istoričeskie*

what has been called history is fully and quintessentially myth; their structures of conceptualization and narrative composition, and the cognitive values they impart, are mythical, not rational-historical. Kuliš, in contrast, was indeed a writer of historical fiction, and, for that matter, also a historian in the strict or academic sense. But this, too, must be qualified, for the actual, determining feature of his perspective on the Cossack past is not "merely" historical, but *a historicist debunking of myth,* specifically of Ševčenko's myth. Rather than confining himself to an objectivist stance, or to the correction of errors and "sins" against historical truth, Kuliš constructs nothing short of a program which is not only rationalistic, but militantly anti-mythical. In intrinsic terms, the difference between Gogol' and Ševčenko, on the one hand, and Kuliš, on the other, is the difference between symbolic and rational thought.

As I use it here, myth is not only a narrative that tells a "sacred," deep, and abiding—and intrinsically unverifiable—"truth," but also a complete, closed, symbolic system. A myth is always telling us something essential about the cultural reality; its purpose may be explanatory or normative, i.e., as a prescription for, or a reinforcement of, existing social structures; in either case, it is an attempt to grasp the *totality* of a given set of phenomena by non-rational, symbolic means. In this reliance on the symbolic and the affective also lies the great power of myth. In its basic functioning myth moves, as Lévi-Strauss has argued, from structure to event, that is, a basic relationship or "truth" may generate any number of plot lines, events, or characters.[4] The structure in question is both psychological (personal) and collective (universal), which is to say that the myth articulated by an individual writer is a *mediation* between personal and collective thought. (Anonymous, i.e., primitive or classical myth, on the other hand, is purged of the personal element in the retelling; it becomes worn down and polished, like a pebble by the waves of the sea, so that only the essence of collective thinking remains.)

* * *

Gogol', as we know, tried his hand at writing a history of the Ukraine, but

---

vzgljady T. G. Ševčenka (Leningrad, 1964), or *Istoryčni pohljady T. H. Ševčenka,* ed. I. O. Huržij et al. (Kiev, 1964). In the case of Kuliš the question seems self-evident; cf. B. Nejman, "Kuliš i Val'ter Skott," *Pantelejmon Kuliš: Ukrajins'ka akademija nauk, Zbirnyk istoryčno-filolohičnoho viddilu,* vol. 53 (Kiev, 1927), pp. 127-56.

4 See Claude Lévi-Strauss, "The Structural Study of Myth," in *Myth: A Symposium,* ed. Thomas A. Sebeok (Bloomington, 1972), pp. 81-106; and idem, *The Savage Mind* (Chicago, 1966).

he quickly abandoned the project, suggesting that the reason lay in his disappointment with the available chronicles.[5] But it is clear that history—whether written or taught—was quite uncongenial to him. Its very nature required a reasoned exposition of events, causes, dates, etc., whereas Gogol' passionately wanted to convey the *totality* of the past, with all its emotional states and experiences. In fact, he wished to make the past contemporaneous, timeless—and this can be done only in the symbolic system of a myth.

Such a myth, encompassing both the past and the present, is given in Gogol''s Ukrainian stories of *Dikan'ka* and *Mirgorod*. No one story gives a full statement of the myth, but when they are superimposed and ordered, a coherent world results, i.e., a world which, despite its comedy and exuberant activity, is in decline and moving toward decrepitude. It is a world, as we see from the story "Zakoldovanoe mesto," that is suspended in an abnormal state, where almost everything is ultimately "ne tak." Taking the stories cumulatively, it is a world that is "cursed" or, more precisely, in the process of transition.[6] That world's full meaning—especially with reference to the past and to Cossackdom—can best be seen by looking more closely at the longest story of the two cycles, *Taras Bul'ba*.

In many respects *Taras Bul'ba* is the most revealing exposition of Gogol''s myth of the Ukraine; it is also a work that is almost universally misunderstood. In the pre-Revolutionary and Soviet periods, it was read—and indeed still is today—as a sublime statement of patriotism, sacrifice for the fatherland, bravery, friendship, and genuine democratic heroism. At the same time, it is taken as historically true, in fact, as a higher synthesis of history. In short, the story is perceived precisely as a myth—as something that is both ideal and true. What is most striking, however, is that such perceptions have become established not only in the popular, but also in the Soviet scholarly opinion. There, of course, it is called "history," not "myth," as we see in this statement from a representative study:

> The power of Gogol''s novel lies not in the creation of a concrete historical event or figure, etc., but in the fact that it could include highly important features typical

[5] See his letter to Sreznevskij of 6 March 1834, in N. V. Gogol', *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij* (hereafter *PSS*), vol. 10 (Moscow, 1952), pp. 298–99. See also George S. N. Luckyj, *Between Gogol' and Ševčenko* (Munich, 1971), p. 111 and passim.

[6] Abnormality, suspension of the normal laws of existence, or, metaphorically speaking, the quality of being "cursed," are precisely the defining features of what Victor Turner, and Van Gennep before him, call "liminality," i.e., the central phase of an individual's or a group's rite of passage; cf. below.

of the life of the *whole* epoch of the National Liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people against the "Polish Yoke." Nalyvajko and Pavljuk, Taras Trjasylo and Ostrjanycja could recognize themselves in Taras Bul'ba. . . . And in this lies the greatest triumph of the realistic historicism of the artist.[7]

The classical features of myth, its totality and yet factual indefiniteness, are taken as aspects of "realistic historicism." (This tendency to blend the real and the "ought to be," one might add, is characteristic of the pre-secularized nature of official Soviet thought in general, not only of its literary criticism.)

To state it most succinctly, the myth in *Taras Bul'ba* presents the flowering of Cossack strength, the emergence of conflict, and the passing of the Cossack "spirit" into immortality and a new sphere. As in Gogol''s other Ukrainian works, the basic structure here is founded on dualism and constitutes a rite of passage in the form of initiation.[8]

The most basic dichotomy for Gogol' is between man and woman, and upon it he builds the further distinction between the settled and the Cossack way of life.[9] These are presented at the very beginning, as soon as Taras Bul'ba's sons come home from Kiev. The difference between the male and the female world is immediately signalled on a level close to Gogol''s heart—in the choice of food. Thus, as they prepare to welcome their children, Taras tells his wife: "Ne nužno pampušek, medovikov, makovnikov i drugix pundikov; tašči nam vsego barana, kozu davaj, medy sorokaletye! Da gorelki pobol'še, ne s vydumkami gorelki, s izjumom i vsjakimi vytreben'kami, a čistoj, pennoj gorelki . . ." (p. 43).[10] (The contrast, one might add, with the gamut of confitures and recherche brandies of the old-world landowners, the Tovstogubs, could not be greater.) The dichotomy extends to other habits, as well: thus while the women (and the peasants) sleep in their houses, Taras and his sons sleep outside under the stars. The issue is fully dramatized when Taras Bul'ba feels the call of the male, Cossack world:

Какого дьявола мне здесь ждать? Чтоб я стал гречкосеем, домоводом, глядеть за овцами да за свиньями да бабиться с женой? Да пропади она: я козак, не хочу! (p. 45)

[7] Mašinskij, *Istoričeskaja povest' Gogolja*, p. 137.
[8] This is true of various mythical treatments of the Ukraine, e.g., Rzewuski's *Zaporożec* or, especially, Słowacki's *Sen srebrny Salomei*; cf. *The Ukraine as Myth*.
[9] Cf. his "Vzgljad na sostavlenie Malorossii," published in the *Arabesques*, with the subtitle "A Fragment from the History of the Ukraine. Volume I, Book I, Chapter 1." This is all that ever appeared of Gogol''s planned work in "six small or four large volumes."
[10] *PSS*, vol. 2 (1948), pp. 43. All subsequent page references in the text are to this edition.

And this, in turn, becomes a general call to arms in the words of an archetypal *esaul*; significantly, that call asserts the Cossack life and negates the settled world:

Эй вы, пивники, броварники! полно вам пиво варить, да валяться по запечьям, да кормить своим жирным телом мух! Ступайте славы рыцарской и чести добиваться! Вы, плугари, гречкосеи, овцепасы, баболюбы! полно вам за плугом ходить, да пачкать в земле свои желтые чеботы, да подбираться к жинкам и губить силу рыцарскую! Пора доставать козацкой славы! (p. 47)

And we are told that just as Taras breaks up the pots and pans and bottles in his house (and this, we remember, was precisely the universe of Afanasij Ivanovič and Pulxerija Ivanovna Tovstogub), so the Cossacks, too, break the tools of their trade and heed the call.

The Zaporozhian Sich at which they arrive is the epitome of the Cossack world. It is characterized by revelry and violence (e.g., the attack on the Jews), by the liberating ritual of the dance, by self-sufficiency (e.g., the vignette of the Cossack darning his own shirt)—and by the absence of women. Moreover, it is a world unencumbered by possessions. In contrast to Ivan Ivanovič Perepenko, the character in "The Two Ivans" who has everything, all the Cossacks' belongings are communal; in contrast to the distant relative of the Tovstogubs who goes to market to compare prices and never spends more than a ruble, we are told that the Zaporozhians "nikogda ne ljubili torgovat'sja, a skol'ko ruka vynula iz karmana deneg, stol'ko i platili" (p. 66).

The distinction betwen the Cossack world and that of the settled toilers is only the first of the dichotomies, and, as we see, the principle of opposition extends to the Cossacks themselves. Although dispute and bickering accompanied the election of the *koševoj*, this was but a temporary friction, not a basic division. Such a division occurs when one half of the Cossacks decides to fight the Turks and the other half votes to go against the Poles, and it is given symbolic importance: "I vse stali perexodit', kto na pravuju, kto na levuju storonu" (p. 126). This, however, is but a foreshadowing of a much more ominous division. Later in the story, a number of Cossacks want to make peace with the Poles, but for Taras Bul'ba this is a betrayal of a sacred cause: "Ej, getman i polkovniki!" he shouts, tearing his tuft of hair, "*ne sdelajte takogo bab'ego dela!* ne verte ljaxam: prodadut psjajuxi!" (emphasis mine; p. 167). When Taras breaks his sword in anger and frustration, his act symbolizes the division that has entered into the Cossack world.

The arena for the full dramatization of division, however, is the microcosm of the family. Taras's son Andrij betrays the faith and the fatherland

for the love of a Polish woman. But the love itself is a functional, "manipulative" element: as such it corresponds to various tried plot devices (such as, for example, the Scottian device of lovers separated by a siege).[11] On the deeper level, Andrij's rejection of the Cossack cause is a movement toward the world of women, "family," and personal values; it is treason on *all levels,* as Andrij himself says:

Кто сказал, что моя отчизна Украйна? Кто дал мне ее в отчизны? Отчизна есть то, чего ищет душа наша, что милее для нее всего. Отчизна моя—ты! Вот моя отчизна! И понесу я отчизну сию в сердце моем, понесу ее, пока станет моего веку, и посмотрю, пусть кто-нибудь из козаков вырвет ее оттуда! *И все, что ни есть, продам, отдам, погублю за такую отчизну!* (emphasis mine; p. 106)

The second major plane of the myth in *Taras Bul'ba* is that of initiation, and its success and failure, respectively, in Ostap and Andrij. As in so many works on the Cossack theme, the Sich is the place of initiation here. One's very departure for it is the first step in the passage from boyhood to manhood, as we see in the eloquent conclusion of chapter 1: "Proščajte i detstvo, i igry, i vsë, i vsë!" (p. 52). It is there that the boys learn the martial arts. The initiation itself, the ordeal, consists of the "tasks" that are presented on the field of battle, and it is here that Andrij's transition to the world of full manhood is reversed: he returns (with a woman—the Tartar servant girl) through a tunnel (!) to a woman. There he embraces his beloved and a life totally different from that of the Cossacks. His initiation is cut short, and this must inevitably lead to his death. Gogol' presents this quite clearly in his depiction of the fatal kiss:

Полный не на земле вкушаемых чувств, Андрий поцеловал в сии благовонные уста, прильнувшие к щеке его, и небезответны были благовонные уста. Они отозвались тем же, и в сем обоюднослиянном поцелуе ощутилось то, что один только раз в жизни дается чувствовать человеку.

И погиб козак! Пропал для всего козацкого рыцарства! (p. 107)

That Andrij does not become a man is evident in his final moments, when he confronts his father on the field of the battle: "Pokorno, kak rebënok, slez on s konja i ostanovilsja ni živ, ni mertv pered Tarasom"; and the images of his death, with utter consistency, are those of the agricultural, settled mode: "Kak xlebnyj kolos, podrezannyj serpom, kak molodoj barašek, počujavšij pod serdcem smertel'noe zelezo, povis on golovoj i povalilsja na travu, ne skazavši ni odnogo slova" (p. 144).

Ostap, on the other hand, proceeds through his initiation to a different destiny. After becoming an *ataman* (otaman), he is captured and exe-

[11] Cf. V. Gippius, *Gogol'* (Leningrad, 1924; reprint, Providence, 1966), p. 73.

cuted in a cruel ordeal. The images of his death intentionally evoke association with Christ's passion on the cross, particularly in his last cry to his father. His ordeal is fully meaningful, however, because he becomes a martyr for the cause; in him, as subsequently in Taras Bul'ba himself, the Cossack cause will see its highest ideals, and the Orthodox faith its true defender. Like the Resurrected Christ, they will live on in memory and tradition.

Through their sacrifice (paradigmatically, that of Ostap and Taras Bul'ba), the Cossacks and the Ukraine they represent pass on to a new, higher, and mature state. This state is more implied than elaborated, but as we see from the conclusion of the second redaction of *Taras Bul'ba* and from the psychological movement of the Ukrainian stories, it generally equals integration into the all-Russian imperial context. The rite of passage in *Taras Bul'ba* can thus be seen as a synecdoche for the entire myth: the Ukraine and the Cossacks in fundamental transition, passing through the "curse," through abnormality and "death," into a different mode of existence.

* * *

Ševčenko's perspective on the Cossack past is also mythical, indeed, more intensely so than Gogol''s. His so-called historical poems (as I have argued in detail elsewhere, and can only assert here)[12] are eminently mythical: all the facts of history—chronology, historical figures and events, causes, and processes—are subordinated to a symbolic code. A moment from a *duma* can thus be as important as a fact from a historical source; indeed it is more important because it reveals the "holy truth" with which Ševčenko as myth-carrier and myth-maker is concerned. As in the case of Gogol', Ševčenko's vision of the Ukraine's past and present is couched in fundamental oppositions, and he, too, shows the Ukraine moving through its liminal "cursed" state into a higher reality, subsumed under a millenarian vision of the future. Ševčenko's oppositions differ from Gogol''s, however. Rather than being that of Cossack and non-Cossack, male and female, they are the opposition of *communitas* and structure.

The concept of communitas and structure (i.e., society as a structured body) were developed by Victor Turner while discussing the rites of

12 See especially chapter 2 of my forthcoming book, *The Poet as Myth-Maker and Myth-Carrier: A Study of Symbolic Meaning in Ševčenko*. The discussion of Ševčenko which follows is excerpted from this study.

passage that he takes to be a central moment in the study of culture and society. Turner observes

> two major "models" for human interrelatedness, juxtaposed and alternating. The first is of society as a structured, differentiated, and often hierarchical system of politico-legal-economic positions with many types of evaluation, separating men in terms of "more" or "less." The second, [communitas] is of society as an unstructured or rudimentarily structured and relatively undifferentiated comitatus, community, or even communion of equal individuals. . . .[13]

Thus, two ideal and ideally opposite models of society are posited: on the one hand, the poor, the weak, the disenfranchised, the margins of society; on the other, the rich and the powerful, the world of rank and authority.

The opposition of communitas and structure clearly models Ševčenko's concept of the Ukraine of his day. His metaphoric formulation of the Ukraine in many poems is precisely that of a weeping widow, indeed a blind cripple, abandoned and mistreated by her sons. But because his vision is essentially synchronic, not historical, mythic, not causal, the past is also modeled by this opposition, and the Ukrainian body politic, specifically Cossackdom itself, is split, like the Ukraine of the present, between communitas and structure. The task of the poet as myth-carrier is to resolve the opposition, first by divining and expounding the deep meaning of this conflict and then by mediating it.

For Ševčenko, therefore, the Cossacks are both communitas and structure; paradoxically, to him they exemplify both the "native" values of freedom, equality, and emotional spontaneity, and the "foreign" features of authority, hierarchy, and power. In one sense, as Soviet critics are quick to point out, this opposition is a function of class stratification—of the tension between the poor rank and file, or *sirjaky*, and the propertied Cossack upper classes, or *staršyna* and *karmazyny*—as well as of Ševčenko's clear identification, as Kuliš was perhaps the first to observe, with the former.[14] Mythical thought, however, is not reducible to rational, socio-

[13] Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process* (Chicago, 1969), p. 96.

[14] In an unsigned autobiographical article ("Žizn' Kuliša," *Pravda*, 1868, no. 24) Kuliš describes his first meeting with Ševčenko in this manner:

> Kuliš did not quite like Ševčenko for his cynicism; he put up with his eccentricities for the sake of his talent. Ševčenko, on the other hand, did not like Kuliš's aristocratism. . . . Kuliš loved cleanliness around his tidy person; he loved order in things and time; his ear was like that of a maiden, nobody ever heard him use foul language. It would be possible to say that this was a meeting between the lowland Cossack from the Sich and a rich city Cossack. Indeed they were representatives of both parts of Cossackdom. Ševčenko represented the Right-Bank Cossacks

political distinctions: the very fact that Cossackdom, which for Ševčenko was a single object of emotional apprehension, contained so profound a contradiction demanded that its resolution be posited on an emotional, i.e., symbolic, and not merely intellectual plane.

In their "purest" (i.e., both "holiest" and least ambivalent) form the Cossacks are a nameless, undifferentiated collective. This is projected consistently and in various contexts: in their fusion into a single agent in scenes of battle, e.g., *Hamalija* or *Hajdamaky*; in overt statements of unanimity of purpose and opinion, as in the election of a Hetman (". . . I odnohlasne, odnostajne/Hromada vybrala hetmana," "U nedilen'ku u svjatuju"); in the common bond of suffering (e.g., "Son [Komedija]" or "Iržavec'"); and, above all, in the ultimate equality, anonymity, and indeed freedom of the common grave. More than any other, the image of the *mohyla,* the burial mound "tightly packed" with the dead, serves as Ševčenko's key metaphor for the Cossacks and the past in general. Thus in "Poslanije," the poet counters the self-congratulatory claims of the more vapid enthusiasts of the Ukrainian past by saying that the Cossack glory and freedom that to their mind overshadows the glories of the Roman heroes, the Brutuses and Coccleses, in fact slept on heaps of "free" and looted Cossack corpses:

Кров'ю вона умивалась,
А спала на купах,
На козацьких вольних трупах,
Окрадених трупах!

(lines 145–48)

In "Za bajrakom bajrak" (to which we shall return), the three hundred Cossacks in the common grave are called "pure as glass." But the most explicit presentation of the Cossack common grave as a holy sepulchre, virtually a temple of the ideal of communitas, occurs in "Buvaje v nevoli inodi zhadaju," where the poet's persona, in the guise of a child, is instructed by the Cossack who steps out of the mohyla and takes him in his arms:

> who after the treaty of Andrusovo were left without leadership and, finding themselves under Polish domination, fled to the Sich and from there returned to their landlords' estates as rebellious *hajdamaky* . . . anxious to smash the landlords completely. Kuliš was a descendant of the Cossacks who sat in council with the tsar's boyars, formed for Tsar Peter the Little Russian Collegium, helped Tsarina Catherine to write her Code and to introduce schools in place of old seminaries.

Cited in Luckyj, *Between Gogol' and Ševčenko,* p. 146.

—Дивися, дитино, оце козаки
(Ніби мені каже), на всій Україні
Високі могили. Дивися, дитино,
Усі ті могили, усі отакі.
Начинені нашим благородним трупом,
Начинені туго. Оце воля спить!

Лягла вона славно, лягла вона вкупі
З нами, козаками! Бачиш, як лежить—
Неначе сповита! . . Тут пана немає,
Усі ми однако на волі жили!
Усі ми однако за волю лягли,
Усі ми і встанем, та бог його знає,
Коли-то те буде.

(lines 24-36)

Anonymity, however, is not absolutely essential, and there are numerous instances where Cossacks are named. But these are without exception either legendary heroes, such as Ivan Pidkova, or the entirely fictional Hamalija, or the leaders of Cossack uprisings—Taras Trjasylo, Loboda, Nalyvajko, Ostrjanycja, and Palij—or, finally, leaders of Hajdamak uprisings—Honta, Zaliznjak, Švačka. All of them are rebels against authority, defenders of the poor and oppressed, "holy avengers," in short, the very incarnation of the ideal of communitas.[15] Significantly, those Cossack leaders who are clearly representatives of structure, rather than rebels or avengers, and yet are presented favorably are perceived positively by virtue of being opponents and victims of Russian imperial designs—most clearly, Hetman Polubotok in "Son," and Dorošenko in "Zastupyla čorna xmara" (where he is called a "Zaporozhian brother"), and implicitly, the colonel Čečel' in "Velykyj l'ox" and the Zaporozhian otaman Hordienko in "Iržavec'." Finally, the very fact of seeking to continue Cossack institutions, i.e., A. Holovatyj's formation of the Black Sea Cossack army (cf. "Slipyj"/"Nevol'nyk"), suffices to give a figure a positive cast.[16]

But Cossackdom as a structured system, specifically its figures of

[15] Thus, too, the Cossack raids on Turkey ("Hamalija" and "Ivan Pidkova") are portrayed here, as in the dumy, as motivated by the desire to free captive fellow Cossacks rather than to obtain booty.

[16] An oblique reference to Sahajdačnyj in "Hamalija" also focuses only on his legendary military prowess and the (erroneous) belief that at the end of his life he entered a monastery; both moments, again, characterize Sahajdačnyj as one with the elemental Cossack ethos and not as a representative of structure. A passing reference to Sahajdačnyj in *Hajdamaky* (line 1121) refers not to the man, but to his time.

power and authority, presents an entirely different picture. Apart from Polubotok and Dorošenko, who for Ševčenko become victims of stronger external forces and martyrs for the common cause—thus expiating by misfortune their high status and, in a word, suffering status reversal—the Cossack hetmans are invariably depicted in dark colors.[17] By far the most attention is given to Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj, who for Ševčenko (as for so many of his contemporaries) symbolizes the Cossack *state*. The poet's attitude toward Xmel'nyc'kyj ranges from invective and derision in such poems as "Jakby to ty Bohdane p"janyj" and "Za ščo my ljubymo Bohdana" to bitter reproaches for foolishly accepting Muscovite sovereignty over the Ukraine. In "Rozryta mohyla" Mother Ukraine herself calls him a foolish son and reproaches herself for not killing him when he was still an infant. In "Slipyj" his very memory is reviled in Cossack songs (the real-life equivalent of the pathetic personification of "Rozryta mohyla"), songs that contrast eloquently with the piety with which Honta and Zaliznjak are remembered:

І співали удвох собі
Про Чалого Саву,
Про Богдана недомудра,
Ледачого сина,
І про Гонту мученика,
Й славного Максима.

(lines 655–60)

In "Velykyj l'ox" even songs about the hetman carry a curse, for the three minstrels are thrashed by the Russian authorities for singing about the "swindler" Bohdan. Finally, in the sequel to this poem, in "Stojit' v seli Subotovi," the poet offers Xmel'nyc'kyj partial forgiveness, but at the same time elaborates on what precisely his "sin" was: above all, betraying-deceiving the Ukraine ("Zanapastyv jesy vbohu/Syrotu Ukrajnu"). Here, Xmel'nyc'kyj's role is one with many of Ševčenko's male characters, who seduce and abandon or generally victimize their women; the structure of the relationship precisely recapitulates the pattern of inequality and vic-

[17] A partial exception is Mazepa, toward whom Ševčenko is reticent and somewhat ambivalent (there is only one passing reference to him in the poetry, in "Iržavec'"). On the manifest level, Mazepa is depicted neither positively nor negatively, but simply shown as fleeing with the Swedes after the battle of Poltava. Although clearly sympathizing with the Cossacks' cause against Peter I, Ševčenko does not make the hetman an incarnation of that anti-imperial cause (as he does Polubotok and Dorošenko), but implicitly charges him with factionalism and self-interest (cf. "Iržavec'," lines 9–12).

timization found earlier in Ševčenko's depiction of the family. As so many of his *pokrytky*, the Ukraine is not only used and abandoned, but indeed left to suffer for the sins of the false husband-father. The words the poet speaks to the title characters of "Knjažna"—"Ty šče budeš pokutovat'/ Hrixy na sim sviti,/ Hrixy bat'kovi . . ."—can equally characterize the fate of the Ukraine after Xmel'nyc'kyj, popularly called "bat'ko Xmel'nyc'kyj." The second aspect of the hetman's sin reflects just as directly the essential nature of structured authority as it appears in Ševčenko's mythic thought: it is destructive of the national ethos (the metaphorical "nen'ka-Ukrajina") because it is basically alien to it. Ultimately structured authority is a form of existential absurdity, or, in Ševčenko's earthier idiom, folly. His address to Xmel'nyc'kyj brings this out most clearly:

Отаке-то, Зіновію,
Олексіїв друже!
Ти все оддав приятелям.
А їм і байдуже
Кажуть, бачиш, що все то те
Таки й було наше,
Що вони тільки наймали
Татарам на пашу—
Та полякам . . .

(lines 29–37)

The wages of friendship with someone so alien as the Muscovite despot is becoming his and history's fool, and the fate of following generations will be to become a laughing stock of nations: "Tak smijutsja z Ukrajiny/ Storonniji ljudy!"

The refrain of Xmel'nyc'kyj's folly runs through Ševčenko's depictions of the hetman,[18] but it must be seen as part of a much broader dialectical set of Wisdom/Folly (or True Wisdom/False Wisdom) that constitutes the metaphysical essence, as it were, of the communitas/structure opposition. For it is the nature of structure, of the representatives of hierarchy and authority—be they the Russian tsar and the imperial apologists, or the biblical Saul, or Xmel'nyc'kyj with his plans, or indeed Ševčenko's

[18] Thus, for example, the four-line poem "Za ščo my ljubymo Bohdana" (which, along with "Jakby to ty Bohdane p"janyj," is usually omitted in the popular Soviet editions of Ševčenko):

За що ми любимо Богдана?
За те, що москалі його забули,
У дурні німчики обули
Великомудрого гетьмана.

fellow Ukrainians, the gentlemen-fanciers of German Idealism and other fashionable theories[19]—to place their faith in reason and power and the existing order. But in the true, transcendent order of things this is mere folly. In fact, it is the apparent folly of the Holy Fool (the *jurodyvyj*) and the prophet (indeed the *kobzar*, as well), and the untutored heart of the common man—in a word, the truth of communitas—that will ultimately be vindicated. The most fervent expression of this occurs when the poet, echoing Isaiah and Jeremiah, exhorts his noble countrymen to "Stop and become human":

Схаменіться! будьте люди,
Бо лихо вам буде.
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
Умийтеся! образ божий
Багном не скверніте.
Не дуріте дітей ваших,
Що вони на світі
На те тілько, щоб панувать . . .
Бо невчене око
Загляне їм в саму душу
Глибоко! глибоко!
Дознаються небожата,
Чия на вас шкура,
Та й засядуть, і премудрих
Немудрі одурять!

("Poslanije," lines 63–64 and 79–90)

As with Xmel'nyc'kyj, the hierarchy of Cossackdom, over the course of history, is depicted as both foolish and destructive. Hetman Samojlovyč is simply called "stupid," and Kyrylo Rozumovs'kyj, with his Council of Elders, are powdered lackeys, dogs licking the slippers of Catherine II; Ivan Skoropads'kyj is called a "stupid hetman" merely in passing, in the course of Ševčenko's excoriation of one of his "degenerate" descendants.[20]

[19] Cf. "Poslanije," lines 91–99:

Якби ви вчились так, як треба,
То й мудрость би була своя.
А то залізете на небо:
«І ми не ми, і я не я,
І все те бачив, і все знаю,
Нема ні пекла, ані раю,
Немає й бога, тілько я!
Та куций німець узловатий,
А більш нікого! . .»

[20] Cf. "Zastupyla čorna xmara": "Iz-za Dnipra napyraje—/Durnyj Samojlovyč" (lines 7–8); or in "Slipyj": "Kyrylo z staršynamy/Pudrom osypalys'/I v caryci, mov

The judgments on Cossack structure as a collective entity are somewhat more developed, but no less categorical. To be sure, in the first of these, in the opening lines of "Svjato v Čyhyryni" in *Hajdamaky*, the tone is one of lament at the passing of Cossack glory rather than of condemnation of any agent of this decline. In "Poslanije," however, this condemnation becomes articulated in the sharpest invective that modern Ukrainian literature had yet seen:

. . . ось що
Ваші славні Брути:
Раби, подножки, грязь Москви,
Варшавське сміття—ваші пáни,
Ясновельможнії гетьмани.

(lines 159–63)

Or, again, in one of the last poems, "Buvaly vojny i vijs'koviji svary," he enumerates the famous names of the Cossack upper class in the plural, as so much worthless "stuff":

Бували войни й військовії свари:
Галагани, і Киселі, і Кочубеї-Нагаї—
Було добра того чимало.
Минуло все, та не пропало,
Остались шашелі

(lines 1–5)

The reason for Ševčenko's judgment is clear: after the dissolution of Cossackdom, most of its elite, the staršyna, became incorporated into the Russian imperial serf-owning nobility, while the rank and file Cossack —their former brothers—became their serfs. Outrage at this obscene dissolution and perversion of the original ideal order, of the "golden age," which invariably is postulated in mythical thought—with Ševčenko's thought no exception—is expressed in a great number of his poems, both in conscious, polemical-ideological excoriations of the existing system (cf., for example, "Poslanie" or "P.S.") and in various symbolic constructions. As stark as it is, however, this inversion of the Cossack ideal, from freedom and equality to total power for some and slavery for others, is for Ševčenko only the narrower case of a universal curse hanging over mankind, which is man's unbridled drive to control and oppress his fellow man, to establish structure over communitas. Thus, "Saul," the poem that traces the origins of structure and authority (which, *nota bene*, is shown

sobaky, / Patynky lyzaly" (lines 625–28); or in "P.S.": "Ščyryj pan, / Potomok het'mana durnoho, / I prezavzjatyj patriot" (lines 12–14).

as coming from Satan himself: "Až os' lyxyj carja nese/Z zakonamy, z mečem, z katamy, Z knjazjamy, temnymy rabamy . . ."), ends with apparent bleak pessimism:

> . . . Горе! Горе!
> Дрібніють люде на землі,
> Ростуть і висяться царі!
>
> (lines 110–12)

The most pointed expression of this conflict in the Cossack world, i.e., in the Ukrainian past as such, is the sin of fratricide, which stands as a direct parallel to the "crimes against nature"—parricide, infanticide, incest—that occur, with much insistence, within the timeframe of the present. The first intimation of this is given in "Son" (Hory moji vysokiji): "Upyvalys' i čužoji/i svojeji krovi" ([and they, the Cossacks] were drunk with foreign/and their own blood). There is, however, a more extensive elaboration, remarkable for both its power and explicitness. In the prison cycle poem "Za bajrakom bajrak" (1847), Ševčenko presents an old Cossack rising at night from the burial-mound to walk the steppe and sing a sorrowful song, and then, at the cock's third crow, to sink back into his grave. Its setting, the direct communion with the mohyla, is already an unfailing sign of the utmost seriousness of its message, and the Cossack's "song," the heart of the poem, is indeed a central statement:

> —Наносили землі,
> Та й додому пішли,
> І ніхто не згадає.
> Нас тут триста, як скло!
> Товариства лягло!
> І земля не приймає.
> Як запродав гетьман
> У ярмо християн,
> Нас послав поганяти.
>
> По своїй по землі
> Свою кров розлили
> І зарізали брата.
> Крові брата впились
> І отут полягли
> У могилі заклятій.—
>
> (lines 8–22)

In consequence of the sin of spilling their brothers' blood, the Cossacks are cursed by the very earth's refusing to accept them and, even more, by the fact that they will not live on in collective memory, that "no one

remembers." The tension, the contradiction, in the Cossack phenomenon is again evoked in the paradox that despite their sin and the apparent consequent curse, they are still called "pure as glass." One the one hand, this recapitulates the conflict of communitas and structure on the manifest social level, for it is the hetman himself who orders them to this deed; the poem re-evokes the social conflict in the past, the "sinful" flaw in the social order, and as such parallels Ševčenko's rational and "ideological" imperative, stated in so many earlier poems (particularly of the "Try lita" period), to ponder and discern the true meaning of the nation's past. But the poem also has a deeper symbolic level, for it is at the same time an elaboration of the Cossacks' relationship to death, or, more specifically, to their existential status on the borderline of life and death.

Throughout Ševčenko's poetry the image of the Cossack is almost invariably linked with the image of the grave, the mohyla. Most obviously and generally, this signifies that the Cossacks are now dead and in the past, as we see in the oft-cited opening lines of "Ivan Pidkova":

Було колись—в Україні
Ревіли гармати;
Було колись—запорозці
Вміли пановати.
Пановали, добували
І славу, і волю;
Минулося—осталися
Могили на полі.

(lines 1–8)

Moreover, as the examples noted above show, the common grave of the mohyla exemplifies communitas and hence, for Ševčenko, the sacredness inherent in Cossackdom. But beyond this lies the question of mythical function. As various references in the corpus indicate, and the poems "Za bajrakom bajrak" and "Buvaje v nevoli inodi zhadaju" make eminently clear, the Cossacks and the Cossack grave (mohyla) constitute one mythic-semantic unit, a unit whose primary function is that of ritual revitalization. This is the ritual of the graves that is found in practically all cultures, but which is particularly stressed in moments of deprivation and crisis, as in various millenarian movements; it is a turning to the past to find the collective (or "national") strength for continued existence, a turning to the dead to insure life, in a word, the vitalization of the future through the past. The Cossacks thus function as a remarkably resonant mediator between the past and the future, between life and death. Like all mythical mediations between opposing categories, they assume a preternatural

existence.[21] They are the living-dead. The demonic aspect of this mode is amply reflected in various folkloric versions of Cossacks as sorcerers (*xarakternyky*) who traffic with dark forces.[22] But in Ševčenko—unlike in Gogol', whose Cossack and non-Cossack Ukrainian worlds are shown in radical opposition, with each seeing the other as demonic—the Cossacks' demonic side is largely muted. In *Hajdamaky*, the demonic features of Honta are on the one hand attributable to surface (Byronic) convention, and on the other clearly counterbalanced by his designation as a holy martyr. The unquestionably demonic Mykyta in "Tytarivna" is given a blurred identity as he becomes a Cossack-*panyč*.[23] And only once, in "Xustyna," is a Cossack actually identified as a *xarakternyk*. In fact, for Ševčenko the Cossacks serve a different function. They are, above all, carriers of a profound truth, which is that of an ideal—i.e., free, equal and harmonious—earlier existence of the Ukraine. Indeed, in a manner characteristic of mythical thought, the carrier *is* the message itself: the Cossacks—as the Cossack communitas, of course—*are* the Ukrainian past, and the Ukrainian past is the Cossacks. The two categories are made equal and co-extensive and no other "historical" Ukrainian past is posited by Ševčenko. (This is also appropriate in another, very concrete sense: the Cossacks are the only ones to have a past, for the peasant world—the other aspect of Ukrainian communitas—is timeless, in effect the world of nature, an eternal vegetative cycle. And this is brought out most clearly in the short lyric "Oj čoho ty počornilo . . . .") *Het'manščyna*, the Cossack period (not the territory), is consistently depicted not as a state, a political or social order, the rule of any given hetman, but as a form of ideal existence; in "Son" (Hory moji vysokiji) this is made explicit as the old man (a clear projection of the poet himself) speaks of it in one breath as "God's paradise" (*božyj raj*). Unquestionably, Ševčenko sees the Ukraine of the past as an ideal and as an existential, not political, category.

21 "'Mediation' (in this sense) is always achieved by introducing a third category which is 'abnormal' or 'anomalous' in terms of 'rational' categories. Thus myths are full of fabulous monsters, incarnate gods, virgin mothers. This middle ground is abnormal, non-natural, holy. It is typically the focus of all taboo and ritual observance." Edmund R. Leach, "Genesis as Myth," in *Myth and Cosmos* (Garden City, 1967), p. 4.

22 Living-dead heroes are the subject of P. Revjakin's "Sbliženija i sledy. Entrückte Helden, Lycari nevmyraky," *Osnova*, January 1862.

23 Mykyta is the quintessential demon-lover. He departs for a long journey, and the phrase used here ("V daleku dorohu/Pišov sobi") is also an idiomatic reference to death. His behavior when he returns is demonic in the conventional sense: he seduces a girl, kills his bastard child, and puts the blame on the unfortunate mother, who is then killed by the community. At the end—a compleat vampire— he is fated to live on forever as a Satan-man and to seduce girls.

Similarly, for him the Cossacks are a mythical, not a historical phenomenon. Not only are they not presented historically, their reason for being is not simply to embody the past and its glory, but to reveal the innermost truths about Ukrainian existence *and* to serve as a touchstone on which to base an ideal future. As we see with great clarity in "Buvaje v nevoli," they appear from beyond the grave embodying the sacred revelation of what the Ukraine was and what it can be. In the fallen and ignoble present, the full meaning of this message—the secret of the "great vault" (*velykyj l'ox*) that is the Ukraine and the mohyly that are Cossackdom—is known only to the poet. His prophetic task is to pass it on, to inculcate it upon the hearts of his countrymen. In this task lies the function of the myth-carrier.

* * *

In sharp contrast to Gogol' and Ševčenko, Kuliš fundamentally challenges the mythical perspective on the Cossack past. Both Gogol' and Ševčenko show the Cossack past through mythical oppositions: for Gogol', the opposition was between the Cossack and the non-Cossack (male and female) aspects of Ukrainian society, and for Ševčenko, it was between communitas and structure. The resolutions of their oppositions, while quite different, are also mythical. For Gogol' resolution occurs, on the one hand, in the final decrepitude and collapse of the Cossack Ukraine that we see in such stories as the "Two Ivans" and "The Old-World Landowners" and also in the author-narrator's flight to Petersburg, to Russia; on the other, it happens with the transition of the old Ukraine into a new imperial Russian framework, where the Cossacks—as we see at the end of *Taras Bul'ba*—become a foreshadowing of imperial Russian Orthodox power. For Ševčenko the resolution is contained in a millenarian vision of a new, holy, and just order: "I na onovlenij zemli / Vraha ne bude, supostata / A bude syn i bude maty / I budut' ljudy na zemli." Kuliš, however, does not allow himself such visions. Instead, he proposes an entirely different, rationalistic, and ultimately positivistic program.

To be sure, in his earliest phase Kuliš, like his contemporaries, is still quite enthralled by ethnographic-folkloristic models and their implicit metaphoric, affective, and, of course, collective thinking. His first work in this mode, *Ukrajina* (published in 1843), is an attempt to reconstruct an epic poem covering Ukrainian history from its beginnings to the time of Xmel'nyc'kyj. Consciously invoking the Homeric epos as an ideal type and model (and perhaps also the model of Ossian), Kuliš uses various *dumy* that he had heard and collected, elaborates on them, and fills in gaps with his own dumy. This co-creation, blending the individual and

collective, is quite in keeping with Romantic poetics, but already has one significant departure: his emphasis in the preface on historical completeness. Where Gogol' and Ševčenko work with the structure of oppositions to symbolically convey the deep, concealed essence of the Ukrainian condition, the "holy truth" about its terrible "sin" or "curse," where all of Ševčenko's so-called historical poems are always at most metahistory (i.e., not a statement of *what* happened, but what it all *meant*), Kuliš is here already concerned with recapturing the past in a plenitude of causal sequences of events.

Kuliš's next period of creativity culminated with the publication in 1857 of *Čorna rada,* his major artistic work and the first Ukrainian historical novel. During this time he was guided, on the one hand, by his interest in the historical novel as modeled by Sir Walter Scott, and on the other, even more decisively, by his immersion (largely under the influence of the Polish literary critic and writer Michał Grabowski) in archival and antiquarian research. *Čorna rada* could not stand in sharper contrast to the vision of the Cossack past of either Ševčenko or Gogol', specifically the latter's *Taras Bul'ba,* against which Kuliš consciously measures himself. The novel does indeed try, and quite successfully, to capture the color, the spirit, and the turmoil of the Cossack Ukraine, but it does so not through symbolic and mythical constructs, but through an artistic equivalent of rational, historical analysis. His focus is above all on the delineation of social forces, on the dynamics, values, and aspirations of social groups; in this respect Viktor Petrov is quite correct in calling it the first Ukrainian social novel.[24] It is certainly the first Ukrainian work to see the Cossack past as *history,* for it perceives the past not in terms of emotionally charged absolutes, not as "holy truth" (as Ševčenko did), but as a complex and rationally knowable *process.* Although it is very much a product of Romantic poetics, especially as regards the concern for local color, family history, and above all the utilization of the patterns and devices of the Scottian novel, *Čorna rada* already points to a post-Romantic stance. At the core of this new system of values is a belief in the primacy of reason directed at social and cultural analysis. It is most indicative that the novel's epilogue is a calm, balanced, and extremely insightful inquiry into the interrelation of Russian and Ukrainian literature.

In the years following the appearance of *Čorna rada,* Kuliš comes out

[24] Viktor Petrov, "*Čorna rada,* jak roman socijal'nyj," in *Literatura, Zbirnyk peršyj* (Kiev, 1928), pp. 29–37.

with a number of important historical studies, ranging from the short to the voluminous.[25] His guiding principle is to reevaluate all misconceptions ("myths" in the popular sense) that have accreted to his fellow countrymen's understanding of their past. The central issue is balance and perspective, as he says in an opening passage of his projected but not completed overall history of the Ukraine:

As I begin writing a history of the Ukraine I must [try to] please my fellow countrymen, who love and respect their homeland. But what if they do not find here what they have become accustomed to in their books? We have become used to looking at the history of the Ukraine through our Cossackdom and to turn all our historical writing around the Cossacks. But meanwhile, Cossackdom itself was only a rich flower and sometimes a prickly thistle in the midst of our wild steppe. Apart from the Cossacks, many other things grew on our home ground, and all that which grew, bloomed, died and was born again in another guise, all that constitutes the history of our Ukraine. Thus I have to consider equally each force which battled other forces, and especially care for what was done in the past to affect the present, and what came down to us. We must not look at the past through Cossackdom, but from the distant past to the more recent past, and in that to also study the Cossacks.[26]

In time these views became sharply polemical. Kuliš came to see the Cossacks (and even more so the *hajdamaky*) as an unequivocally destructive, anarchic force, creators of the "Great Ruin" that the Ukraine became at the end of the seventeenth century. Concurrently, in his poetry, which he resumed writing only after the death of Ševčenko, Kuliš engaged in a twofold program that is both an elaboration and an exorcism of Ševčenko's legacy. His first concern, dating back to his earlier contacts with Ševčenko, and the help and advice that he offered him, was with continuing and expanding Ševčenko's essential message, which proclaimed the reborn dignity, power, and creative potential of a nation. His second concern, even while conceived by Kuliš as complementary, came to be seen by many as nothing less than a treacherous and scurrilous attack on Ševčenko. For what Kuliš does, especially in the collections *Xutorna poezija* and *Dzvin*, is to charge Ševčenko with becoming a spokesman and an apologist for destruction and ruin; in Kuliš's view, the Bard became enthralled to a blind and bloodthirsty muse, as he has Ševčenko himself admit in the poem "Z toho svitu" (*Dzvin*):

[25] For example, *Xmel'nyččyna* and *Vyhovščyna* in 1861, and especially *Istorija vossoedinenija Rusi* (1874 and 1877) and *Otpadenie Malorossii ot Pol'ši* (1888–89 and 1890).

[26] "Istorija Ukrajiny od najdavnijšyx časiv," in *Tvory Pantelejmona Kuliša*, vol. 6 (Lviv, 1910), p. 7.

Я був собі пяни́й, а баба Талалайка
Безкостим язиком своїм мене дрочила,
І голову менї, почавши з Наливайка,
Високославними героями набила.

І довела мене аж до ножів сьвячених,
До Ґонти, щó дїтей порізав кателиків,
До православної Руїни дїл скажених,
Щó ними пиндимось проміж земних язиків.

(lines 1–8)

Kuliš's personal attitude toward Ševčenko is more sorrowful than angry, but his condemnation of Ševčenko's heroes, his common Cossacks and hajdamaky, and with it his belief in their "holy cause," is implacably severe. As he says in a poem directed to Ševčenko, "the last Cossack minstrel" ("Ostan'n'omu kobzarevi kozac'komu"; also in *Dzvin*):

Не поляже, кажеш, слава . . .
  Нї, кобзарю, брате!
Прокляла своє козацтво
  Україна мати.

Заробітком розбишацьким
  Гордувати стала,
І поеми гайдамацькі
  Брехнями назвала.

Все-ж бо в них була омана:
  Воля, честь, лицарство,
За що сьвітом колотило
  Без путя козацтво.

Воля—нищить землю панську,
  Честь—людей дурити
А лицарство—християнську
  Кров річками лити.

(lines 29–44)

The only other thing that can draw so much of his scorn are the glorifiers of the "Ruin," the apologists of bloodshed and vengeance whom Kuliš collectively addresses as "hajdamak scribblers." Perhaps their greatest sin, in his eyes, is their total distortion of Ševčenko's legacy:

В імя його сьвяте,
На сором України,
Ви брехнї плетете
Про благодать Руїни.
На глум Тарасові,
Жалкують васі вчені,
Що не дорізали

Панів ножі сьвячені,—
Що Ґонта й Залїзняк
Не стали там князями.
Де правив Мономах
З синами-витязями.

("Pys'makam hajdamakam," *Dzvin*; lines 45-56)

* * *

We cannot examine here the full range and detail of Kuliš's historical views. It is clear, at any rate, that his views were often highly emotional and bitter. But it is utterly fallacious to claim, as Jefremov once did,[27] that they were vacillatory and without a unifying central perspective. On the contrary, it is evident that for most of his mature life, Kuliš came to articulate an understanding of the Cossack past that was in direct opposition to the mythical vision so deeply inscribed on the collective Ukrainian consciousness by Ševčenko. For where Ševčenko apotheizes communitas, Kuliš offers the model, prospects, and demands of structured society. It is precisely with these desiderata of enlightenment, of law and order, of normal cultural and social development in mind that he feels obliged to search, almost desperately, for a model in neighboring states—gentry Poland, imperial Russia, Mohammedan Turkey—for the Cossack world itself can offer only a *styxija,* the anti-structure of communitas. Thus Peter I and Catherine II, who for Ševčenko are the very incarnation of evil, are seen by Kuliš as carriers of enlightenment, who conquer the "barbarism" of anarchy, who come to rule the Ukraine with "the eternal sceptre of science and culture" ("Dvoje predkiv").[28]

Now, one can take strong issue with this interpretation of the past. Kuliš's historico-political reasoning may be shown to be entirely one-sided, but it would be highly unfair to accuse him of condoning despotism. In fact, his opposition to official Russian (or Polish) chauvinism, to oppression of Ukrainian national rights, etc., is manifest, continuous, and vociferous. The crux of the matter, however, is that he sees the only real prospects for the development of the Ukrainian nation in its acceptance not of myth and symbolic thinking, but of the "universal standard" of rational thought and of concrete, constructive action.

Ultimately, Kuliš's debunking of the mythical sense of the Cossack past is not only historicist, but positivist. His own life can be seen as exemplify-

[27] "Bez syntezu," *Zapysky istoryčno-filolohičnoho viddilu,* Akademiia nauk URSR, vol. 4 (Kiev, 1924).
[28] Cf., also, "Petro i Kateryna" and "Vin i vona" (*Dzvin*).

ing the "organic" effort of fostering culture and social betterment. It was none other than Kuliš who was the spiritual father of the Prosvita movement; it was he who at the first anniversary of Ševčenko's death suggested that the best monument to him was not a resplendent mausoleum or sweet praise, but the teaching of trades to village children.[29] In this Kuliš signals the end of Romantic ideology and the birth of an entirely new understanding of the Ukrainian situation and the continuum of Ukrainian history. As much as the myth is still with us, his antithesis has also left its indelible mark on our sense of the Ukrainian past.

Harvard University

[29] ["Nauka remesla i pracja narodna po selax"], *Tvory Pantelejmona Kuliša*, 6: 560–64.

The Stefanyk Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences: A Treasury of Manuscript Collections in Lviv*

PATRICIA KENNEDY GRIMSTED

The Stefanyk Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, with its holdings of over five million volumes, ranks today as one of the largest libraries in the Soviet Union. Its manuscript holdings of over 100,000 units, now grouped into approximately 200 fonds, are the second richest in libraries of the Soviet Ukraine. As the principal library and manuscript repository for the Western Ukraine, the Stefanyk Library stands heir to most of the major manuscript collections that have developed over the centuries in the Lviv area.[1]

The library itself was officially founded by a decree of 2 January 1940,

* The present article is based on data gathered for my forthcoming directory, *Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Ukraine and Moldavia,* to be published by Princeton University Press. Research is being supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Ford Foundation, and the Ukrainian Studies Fund. Research in the Soviet Union and Poland was conducted under the academic exchange programs administered by the International Research and Exchanges Board. I appreciate the assistance of the Academies of Sciences of the USSR and of the Ukrainian SSR, under whose auspices my work was conducted at the Stefanyk Library in Lviv. The staffs of the manuscript divisions of the National Library in Warsaw and the Ossolineum Library in Wrocław assisted with information relating to their holdings.

Researchers should note that most of the descriptive publications mentioned in the footnotes of this article will soon be available in microfiche editions through the Inter Documentation Company (IDC) of Zug, Switzerland. More complete and extensive bibliographic references will be provided in my forthcoming directory.

1 For a survey of major manuscript collections in Lviv prior to 1939, see my related article, "Lviv Manuscript Collections and Their Fate," in *Eucharisterion: Essays in Honor of Omeljan Pritsak on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday, Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3/4 (1979–80): 348–75. Footnotes in that article provide bibliographical references to the relevant earlier catalogues and descriptive publications. Only the most important will be repeated here, and then only if they are still useful descriptions of the manuscripts.

several months after the establishment of Soviet rule in the Western Ukraine. As a branch of the Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev, the library brought together under a single administrative umbrella most of the major previously existing libraries in the Lviv area, together with their rich manuscript holdings.[2] Among the largest collections that the library took over are the holdings of the Library of the Shevchenko Scientific Society (Biblioteka Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka), the Library of the Lviv National Home (Biblioteka Narodnoho domu), the Central Library of the Basilian Order (Tsentral'na Vasyliians'ka biblioteka / Biblioteka Chyna Sviatoho Vasyliia Velykoho), the Baworowski Library (Biblioteka im. Baworowskich), the Ossolineum (Biblioteka Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich), the Library of the Lviv Theological Academy (Biblioteka Bohoslovs'koi akademii u L'vovi), and the Lviv Jewish Community Library (Biblioteka Gminy Izraelickiej). Many private libraries and manuscript collections, as well as the personal papers of many political, religious, and cultural leaders from the area, were also acquired. Indeed, the Lviv branch of the Ukrainian Academy Library consolidated the holdings of some eighty different libraries and separate manuscript collections in the area.

The administrative center of the library was organized in the building occupied by the Ossolineum, which still remains the library's home. Many of the component collections initially remained in their original or traditional location, and even today some parts of the library occupy the buildings of earlier libraries. The consolidation of the Academy Library was interrupted—and indeed reversed—during the German occupation (June 1941–July 1944), when the preexisting libraries were reorganized as parts of a centralized State Library (Staatsbibliothek) network.

Following the reestablishment of Soviet rule in the Western Ukraine in 1944, the library was reorganized again as the Lviv Library of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR (L'vivs'ka biblioteka AN URSR, with the acronym LBAN), along lines similar to those initiated in the 1940–41 period. In 1963 the library was transferred to the administration of the Ministry of Culture of the Ukrainian SSR and renamed the Lviv State Scientific Library (L'vivs'ka derzhavna naukova biblioteka). It was returned to the jurisdiction of the Academy of Sciences in 1969 as the Lviv Scientific

[2] The official decree, "Pro orhanizatsiiu naukovykh ustanov u zakhidnykh oblastiakh URSR," is reprinted in the collection, *Kul'turne budivnytstvo v Ukrains'kii RSR: Zbirnyk dokumentiv*, 2 vols. (Kiev, 1959), 1: 794; but the decree gives no specific data about the library organization.

Library (L'vivska naukova biblioteka AN URSR), and took its present name honoring the Ukrainian writer Vasyl' Stefanyk in 1971 (L'vivs'ka naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka AN URSR).[3]

In the course of the four decades since the library brought together most of the major library and private manuscript collections in the Lviv area, the holdings have been subject to considerable rearrangement. Following standardized Soviet practice, all of the manuscript holdings have been divided into *fonds*, that is to say into integral archival groups bearing a direct relationship to the provenance, nature, and/or collector of the materials involved. In the case of materials that came from major cultural establishments, institutional records per se were separated from the library collections of manuscripts and personal papers. Institutional records, such as those of the Shevchenko Scientific Society and the Lviv National Home, were transferred to the jurisdiction of what is today the Central State Historical Archive of the Ukrainian SSR in Lviv (Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv URSR u m. L'vovi, or TsDIA-L). Records from smaller, local institutions were transferred to the Lviv Oblast State Archive (L'vivs'kyi oblasnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv, or LODA).[4]

Personal papers usually remained with the library manuscript collections and were deposited in the Academy Library. However, the state archives sometimes acquired many major groups of personal papers and miscellaneous documentary materials along with institutional records because a clear-cut distinction had not been made between them. Also, the papers of some important or politically sensitive individuals tended to be shifted to state archival jurisdiction. The net result, as will be seen below, has often been a split in the disposition of some personal papers and institutional records between the Academy Library and the state archives in Lviv.

Aside from the fonds within the manuscript division, there are no major

[3] A brief sketch of the history of the library and outline of its present organization and all categories of holdings is provided in the brief popularized guide, *L'vivs'ka naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka AN URSR: Putivnyk* (Kiev, 1979). The only earlier description was the scant prefatory article in *Skarbnytsia znan': Tematychnyi zbirnyk naukovykh prats'*, ed. M. P. Humeniuk et al. (Lviv, 1972), pp. 4–8. Such historical data have been supplemented by my own findings. The article devoted to the library in *Radians'ka entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy* 3 (1971): 51, cites 1939 as the date of formation, but all other sources give 1940, including the articles published in 1965 to celebrate the library's 25th anniversary.

[4] There is no published guide to the holdings in TsDIA-L; most of those in the oblast archive (LODA) are briefly surveyed in the published guide, *L'vivs'kyi oblasnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv: Putivnyk,* comp. V. I. Kotel'nikova et al. (Lviv, 1965).

groupings or strict subject-matter divisions. Although they do not constitute formal groupings and are not apparent in the assignment of fond numbers, three major types of fonds can be distinguished: (1) major institutional collections, including that of the manuscript division itself; (2) minor groups of institutional records; and (3) personal papers, many of which also include collected manuscripts and estate records.

Some major institutional collections have been retained in their previous arrangement within individual fonds; a notable instance is the Ossolineum collection, in which many of the units had already been bound and catalogued. In such cases, one can use earlier published or unpublished catalogues and the traditional code numbers. However, many collections have been completely reorganized following standardized Soviet guidelines. Some of the large institutional collections remaining in the library have been broken down and separate fonds established for individual groups of personal papers and/or subsidiary collections that had earlier been considered part of the larger collections. This process is still underway, so further changes and reclassification can be anticipated.

Unfortunately, cataloguing and descriptive publications have proceeded very slowly. No general guide or history of the manuscript division has been prepared, and no major catalogue series has been initiated. No overall survey of the manuscript holdings has appeared, other than a one-page summary in the 1979 general guide to the library and a few lines in a 1972 article about the library as a whole.[5] What few descriptive publications and catalogues do exist have been published in limited *rotaprynt* editions which are virtually unobtainable outside major libraries in the USSR. The meager products of the post-World War II Soviet period stand in sharp contrast to the laudable tradition of detailed library manuscript catalogues that evolved in Lviv in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This contrast will be increasingly apparent in the discussion below.[6]

[5] See *LNB AN: Putivnyk*, pp. 28–30, and the prefatory article in *Skarbnytsia znan'*, p. 7. The bibliography of publications by the library during the first quarter century of its existence, O. P. Kushch, comp., *L'vivs'ka derzhavna naukova biblioteka za 25 rokiv, 1940–1965 rr.: Bibliohrafichnyi pokazhchyk* (Lviv, 1965), demonstrates the nearly total neglect in terms of descriptions of manuscript holdings. See also the additional bibliography of LNB AN publications by Kushch in *Skarbnytsia znan'*, pp. 122–54.

[6] Most notable are the admirably detailed catalogues listing individual manuscripts in the Ossolineum in Lviv prepared before and after the First World War (see fns. 43 and 44) and those covering manuscripts in the library of the National Home (see fns.

Most important among these sparse publications is the 1977 directory of personal papers, *Osobysti arkhivni fondy viddilu rukopysiv*. This volume is an essential starting point for researchers trying to identify the tremendous wealth and variety of extant materials. It provides a brief description of the personal papers of 176 individuals or families held by the manuscript division, as either individual fonds or parts of major institutional collections.[7] The directory is not complete, however, and there are no explanations for the omissions, some of which will be mentioned here. But despite its inadequacies, this is clearly the most substantial publication by and about the division to appear in the forty years since the library was founded. Similar in orientation and format to guides to personal papers issued by several Moscow libraries, it is of increased importance because personal papers in the Stefanyk Library are not listed in the general directory of personal papers in Soviet repositories.[8]

Another recent limited-edition subject-oriented catalogue covers Ukrainian and Russian autograph literary manuscripts and letters, in which the division is extremely rich.[9] No comparable coverage has yet been provided for other autographs, although a brief survey has been made of Czech and Slovak autographs.[10] The library also has many autographs of other national or linguistic origins, including letters of Victor Hugo and Napoleon Bonaparte. However, most autographs are not now grouped as a separate

---

26 and 27). The cataloguing tradition of the Ossolineum has been continued in Wrocław, as will be discussed below (see the Wrocław catalogues mentioned in fn. 48).

7 *Osobysti arkhivni fondy viddilu rukopysiv: Anotovanyi pokazhchyk,* comp. Ie. M. Humeniuk, P. H. Babiak, and O. O. Dz'oban (Lviv, 1977; *tirazh*—500 copies). Although the papers of many Polish leaders are included in the listings, original or alternate-language forms are never provided for personal names and only rarely for institutions and publications.

8 It is puzzling that only *one* fond of personal papers from LNB AN is listed in the otherwise helpful directory, *Lichnye arkhivnye fondy v khranilishchakh SSSR: Ukazatel',* 3 vols. (Moscow, 1962–63, 1980). LNB AN data had reportedly been prepared for the third volume (issued in 1980), but not a single listing for the library is included.

9 *Avtohrafy ukrains'kykh i rosiis'kykh pys'mennykiv: Anotovanyi pokazhchyk,* comp. P. H. Babiak, ed. Ie. Ie. Kravchenko (Lviv, 1976).

10 P. H. Bab''iak, ''Avtohrafy prohresyvnykh ches'kykh i slovats'kykh pys'mennykiv i vchenykh,'' *Bibliotekoznavstvo i bibliohrafiia na sluzhbi nauky* (Lviv, 1979), pp. 122–29.

fond—or collection—in the division, except those traditionally grouped together within the Ossolineum collection.

More recent is the 1979 catalogue listing 164 manuscript musical scores dating from the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries. These scores are dispersed among various collections in the division, and some have been listed in earlier catalogues.[11] Only two other *rotaprynt* subject-oriented catalogues have appeared under the library's imprint—one of documents relating to the revolutionary events of 1848 in Galicia, and a second of documents from 1648–54 relating to the Khmel'nyts'kyi uprising.[12]

A series of collective volumes issued by the library—six appeared between 1972 and 1979—include several articles briefly surveying certain groups of documents or materials on other special subjects.[13] A number of survey articles by outside specialists have also appeared in other journals. To date, none of the descriptive publications survey the major institutional collections held by the division, or correlate them with previously published catalogues. Hence, we need to pay particular attention to these holdings here. These major collections will, accordingly, be surveyed first—in order of their assigned fond numbers, along with the individual personal or family papers that came to the library with those larger institutional collections.

The first numbered fond in the Manuscript Division comprises the rich institutional collections of the former Shevchenko Scientific Society (NTSh), which from its establishment in 1873 until 1939 played a central role in Ukrainian cultural and intellectual life in Lviv. The society assumed the role of an Ukrainian Academy of Sciences before the First World War, and subsequently for the Western Ukraine until 1939. In this connection, the library of the NTSh amassed the largest systematic collection of Ukrainica in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. By 1939, the library had

11 *Notoliniini rukopysy XVI–XVII st.: Kataloh,* comp. Ia. P. Iasynovs'kyi and O. O. Dz'oban, ed. Ia. N. Shchapot (Lviv, 1979).

12 *1848 rik v Halychyni: Anotovanyi pokazhchyk rukopysnykh materialiv biblioteky,* comp. V. F. Bandura and T. Iu. Kozachuk et al., ed. I. S. Miller (Lviv, 1953); *Vyzvol'na viina ukrains'koho narodu v 1648–1654 rr. za vozz''iednaniia Ukrainy z Rosiieiu: Anotovanyi pokazhchyk rukopysnykh materialiv biblioteky,* comp. T. Iu. Kozachuk et al., ed. O. P. Kushch (Lviv, 1954).

13 *Skarbnytsia znan'* (1972); *Biblioteka ta informatsiia* (1973); *Knyha i znannia* (1974); *Biblioteka i naukovo-tekhnichnyi prohres* (1975); *Knyha i biblioteka na sluzhbi nauky* (1978); and *Bibliotekoznavstvo i bibliohrafiia na sluzhbi nauky* (1979). All bear the series subtitle, *Tematychnyi zbirnyk naukovykh prats',* are edited by M. P. Humeniuk et al., and were issued in Lviv by LNB AN.

brought together the archives of many West Ukrainian societies, organizations, institutions, editorial offices, and even the records of the "Sich Riflemen" and the Galician Ukrainian armed forces. Major libraries of Ukrainian scholars and literary figures such as Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi and Ivan Franko were bequeathed to the NTSh library, as were the private manuscript collections and personal papers of many distinguished Ukrainians, both from Galicia and the Eastern Ukraine. Unfortunately, a published catalogue was never prepared for the NTSh collection, and only an abbreviated card catalogue is available in the library itself. Many of the manuscript acquisitions were, however, mentioned in published pamphlets, and in annual reports or other notices printed over the years in the NTSh newsletter.[14]

Along with the NTSh library, the Academy Library holds a major part of the documentary legacy of the NTSh, although some parts have been transferred elsewhere. A portion of the society's archival legacy, however, including most of its own institutional records, is now held by the historical archive in Lviv (TsDIA-L), as are some of the personal papers of prominent Ukrainians associated with the NTSh. The records of the ethnographic division of the NTSh, along with some of its most interesting ethnographic collections, were transferred to the Institute of Art, Folklore, and Ethnography in Kiev, and are now retained there.[15] Many personal papers of important writers bequeathed to the NTSh, including those of Ivan Franko, Lesia Ukrainka, and Vasyl' Stefanyk, were transferred to the Institute of Litera-

14 *Khronika Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka u L'vovi*, 74 nos. (Lviv, 1900–14; 1919–38), passim; the longer report in no. 69/70, pp. 7–24, serves as a general review and surveys acquisitions for the years 1926–30. See also the list of major manuscript holdings in the 1936 pamphlet by Volodymyr Doroshenko, *Ukrains'ka natsional'na biblioteka (Biblioteka Naukoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka u L'vovi)* (Lviv, 1936), pp. 8–11. Additional retrospective details about the library are provided in Doroshenko's later article, "Biblioteka Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka u L'vovi," *Zapysky NTSh* 171 (1961): 7–58, and in the pamphlet *Ohnyshche ukrains'koi nauky: Naukove tovarystvo imeni T. Shevchenka* (New York and Philadelphia, 1951).

15 The complete records of the NTSh Ethnographic Division and related records now held in the manuscript division of the Ryl's'kyi Institute of Art, Folklore, and Ethnography of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev are listed and surveyed, along with other private papers and ethnographic collections, in the comprehensive typescript guide in the institute. Two versions of this guide were prepared for publication (dated 1958 and 1971), but unfortunately, this basic reference work has still not appeared in print.

ture of the Academy of Sciences in Kiev, and are held in the manuscript division there.[16]

The basic NTSh collection remaining in the Stefanyk Library is now arranged as fond 1 in the manuscript division. Particularly important among these materials are the nearly three hundred early manuscript books that came from the NTSh library. The earliest is the Church Slavonic parchment gospel known since the nineteenth century as "Apostolus Bybliensis"; it dates from the first half of the fourteenth century.[17] Three manuscript books are from the fifteenth century, but most date from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries. Included in the collection are religious manuscripts and theological codices, historical and literary manuscripts, and other miscellaneous documentary materials.

The Academy Library holds the personal papers and collections of many cultural and political leaders who were associated with the NTSh. These materials were acquired with the society's library in 1940, although, as mentioned above, some of them were transferred elsewhere. Many of these have since been—or are in the process of being—rearranged in the manuscript division and grouped as separate fonds. Most are described briefly in the published guide to personal papers in the library.[18]

Of particular note among the papers of the bibliographer and newspaper editor Ivan O. Levyts'kyi (1850–1913) are the materials for his never-completed biographical directory of Galicia. The preliminary manuscript

16 Most of Franko's library as well as his papers were transferred to Kiev, although a few scattered materials remain in LNB AN and in the Franko Memorial House-Museum in Lviv. The main body of papers was described at the time of their transfer in the mimeographed journal of the Ukrainian Academy Library by Ia. R. Dashkevych, "Arkhiv Ivana Franka," *Zhurnal Biblioteky Akademii nauk URSR,* 1947, no. 1 (3), pp. 83–86. For the Stefanyk papers in Kiev see K. Siekarieva, "Arkhiv Vasylia Stefanyka," *Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo,* 1973, no. 4, pp. 80–83. For the papers of Lesia Ukrainka (pseudonym of Larysa Kosach-Kvitka) see A. M. Polotai, "Rukoiu poetesy (Do 100-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia Lesi Ukrainky," *Nauka i suspil'stvo,* 1971, no. 2, pp. 17–21. I do not have a list of all other writers' papers transferred from Lviv to the Institute of Literature in Kiev. There is no comprehensive guide to the manuscript holdings of the institute, but a survey and bibliography of descriptive articles will be included in my forthcoming directory of Ukrainian archives and manuscript collections.

17 See the study by Peter Kopko, "Apostolus Bybliensis saec XIV: Grammatisch-kritisch analysiert," *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophische-Historische Klasse* 55 (1912): 1–103.

18 See the listings for all of the following groups of papers from the NTSh in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy.*

volumes are arranged in alphabetical order and can be consulted in the division office.[19] Also held in the division are the materials Levyts'kyi collected for his comprehensive Galician-Ukrainian bibliography, including the unpublished parts prepared in the 1890s.[20]

Other personal papers or collections still classified as part of the NTSh library collection include those of the composer Denys Sichyns'kyi (1865–1909).[21] Many of the papers of the musician Evhen Iakubovych (d. ca. 1928), who emigrated to America, were returned to Lviv from Philadelphia in the 1920s; they include many Ukrainian musical autographs. Also included are some papers of the opera singer Modest Mentsins'kyi (1876–1935), the composer and poet Petro Nishchyns'kyi (pseudonym Petro Baida; 1832–96), the antiquarian Iosyf Davydovych (1864–1926), the literary historian and educator Iaroslav Hordyns'kyi (1882–1939), the jurist and translator Iulian Sel's'kyi (1849–1926), the politicians and publicists Heorh Osterman (b. 1808) and Ostap Terlets'kyi (pseudonyms B. Kistka and Ivan Zanevych; 1850–1902), the religious leader and regional specialist of Stanyslaviv (now Ivano-Frankivs'k) Vasyl' Fatsiievych (1847–1921), and the historian and cultural leader Vasyl' Chernets'kyi (1837–1900).

The extensive papers of the Barvins'kyi family were originally organized by the historian Bohdan Barvins'kyi (1880–1958). A large part of the collection, including the papers of Oleksandr Barvins'kyi (1847–1926), came to the library from the NTSh, but some remained as a separate family collection and were received only later. These rich holdings, dating from the period 1801 to 1947, have now been grouped together as fond 11, but are not listed in the published guide to personal papers in LNB AN. Of special note are the multivolume memoirs of Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, which have never been published. The Barvins'kyi collection includes records of several

[19] See the description by Ia. R. Dashkevych, "Materialy I. O. Levyts'koho iak dzherelo dlia bibliohrafichnoho slovnyka," *Istorychni dzherela ta ikh vykorystannia* 2 (1966): 35–53. The Levyts'kyi papers are still classified as part of the NTSh collection (fond 1), and there are a few related papers in the National Home collection (fond 2).

[20] Levyts'kyi's bibliographical contributions have been examined recently by Paul R. Magocsi, "Nationalism and National Bibliography: Ivan E. Levyts'kyi and Nineteenth-Century Galicia," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 28, no. 1 (1980): 81–109. Magocsi's study would have been much more revealing had he been able to utilize the Levyts'kyi papers in LNB AN.

[21] The comprehensive bibliography, *Denys Sichyns'kyi: Materialy do bio-bibliohrafii diiachiv ukrains'koi kul'tury,* comp. S. P. Kostiuk and P. K. Medvedyk (Lviv, 1966), includes a list of Sichyns'kyi manuscripts held as part of the NTSh collection.

small Ukrainian newspapers and journals edited by Oleksandr Barvins'kyi in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[22] For example, a few scattered files remain from the journals *Pravda* (1867–78, 1889–98), *Zoria* (1880–97), and *Meta* (1863–65), and from the newspapers *Dilo* (1880–1939) and *Ruslan* (1897–1914). There are also some scattered records dating from the late nineteenth century which relate to the series "Rus'ka istorychna biblioteka."

Among other important groups of papers coming from the NTSh library but now classified as separate fonds are those of the lawyer, publicist, and folklorist Meliton Buchyns'kyi (1847–1903) (fond 17), and the ethnographers Volodymyr Hnatiuk (1871–1926) (fond 34),[23] Mytrofan Dykarev (pseudonym M. Kramarenko; 1854–99) (fond 151),[24] and Sydir Hlyns'kyi (1860–1931) (fond 159), of the linguist, ethnographer, and editor Omelian Partyts'kyi (1840–95) (fond 154), and of the historian and educator Omelian Terlets'kyi (1873–1958) (fond 115; some parts of the fond were received after his death). The collection from the Zaklyns'kyi family (1818–1974) (fond 48; some parts of the fond were also received later) includes papers of noted cultural figures and educators. A large portion of the papers of the radical publicist and political activist Mykhailo Pavlyk (1853–1915) came to the Academy Library from the NTSh library, but some came with other collections; now grouped together (fond 160), they have been described in two articles.[25] Other Pavlyk papers are held in the historical archive (TsDIA-L).

The Academy Library holds the vast majority of manuscript and documentary materials from the library of the former Lviv "National Home," the important Ukrainian cultural institution founded in Lviv in 1849. The

22 The Barvins'kyi family papers are not mentioned in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*, but are covered by the card catalogue available in the manuscript division.

23 A larger portion of the Hnatiuk papers from the NTSh are now held by the historical archive (TsDIA-L); those in LNB AN are mentioned in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*, pp. 28–30.

24 Regarding the Dykarev papers, see the prefatory note by Ivan Franko in *Posmertni pysannia Mytrofana Dykareva z polia fol'kl'oru i mitol'ohii* (Lviv, 1909; "Zbirnyk filolohichnoi sektsii NTSh," vol. 6), pp. v–xii.

25 See the article by Ie. Ie. Kravchenko, "U borot'bi proty ukrains'koho burzhuaznoho natsionalizmu (Z arkhivnoi spadshchyny M. Pavlyka)," in *Knyha i znannia*, pp. 64–86, and the more recent article by Ie. M. Humeniuk, "Arkhiv M. Pavlyka," *Bibliotekoznavstvo i bibliohrafiia na sluzhbi nauky*, pp. 129–46. Pavlyk papers in TsDIA-L are to be found in fond 663. Some Pavlyk correspondence is integrated into the papers of Ivan Franko in Kiev, while other papers there are arranged in fond 101.

basic National Home collection constitutes fond 2 in the manuscript division. Most of its impressive collection of early manuscript books, dating from the fifteenth through the nineteenth centuries, were described in earlier catalogues and remain intact today.[26]

The rich collection of Antin Petrushevych (1821–1913), totaling over 550 manuscripts from the thirteenth through the nineteenth centuries, originally formed a special division in the National Home; some were catalogued before the First World War. This collection has now been rearranged as part of the separate Petrushevych fond (fond 77), together with the personal papers and other materials in the Petrushevych legacy.[27]

Many other documentary materials came to the division from the National Home, along with part of its institutional archive. However, most of the actual institutional records of the National Home are now held by TsDIA-L. The papers of a number of important West Ukrainian cultural leaders also remain part of the National Home collection. Many represent nineteenth-century leaders of a conservative "Old Ruthenian" orientation, such as Oleksandr Dukhnovych (1803–65), Mykhailo Kachkovs'kyi (1802–72), and Ivan Naumovych (1826–91). Notable individuals whose papers remain in this collection include the writers Bohdan Didyts'kyi (1827–1909), who edited publications for the National Home and the related society, Galician Ruthenian Matytsia *(Halyts'ko-rus'ka matytsia),* and Mykhailo Klemertovych (1836–1903), who also worked on National Home publications; the editor and journalist Osyp Monchalovs'kyi (1858–1906); the writers and

[26] See the two catalogues prepared by I. S. Svientsits'kyi, *Tserkovno- i russko-slavianskie rukopisi Publichnoi biblioteki Narodnogo doma v L'vove* (St. Petersburg, 1904), originally published in *Izvestiia Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi akademii nauk* 9 (1904, no. 3): 350–414; and *Opisanie inoiazychnykh i noveishikh karpatorusskikh rukopisei biblioteki "Narodnogo doma" v L'vove* (Lviv, 1905), originally published in *Nauchno-literaturnyi sbornik "Galitsko-russkoi matitsy"* 3 (1904, no. 4): 81–104; 4 (1905, no. 1): 108–49. Since some of the manuscripts covered by the second catalogue have been rearranged, it is more difficult to correlate them with current holdings.

[27] I. S. Svientsits'kyi, *Opys rukopysiv Narodnoho domu z kolektsii A. Petrushevycha,* 3 vols. (Lviv, 1906–11; "Ukrains'ko-rus'kyi arkhiv," vols. 1, 6, and 7; "Rukopysy L'vivs'kykh zbirok," pts. 1–3); see also O. A. Markov, "Opisanie rukopisei XIX v. sobraniia A. S. Petrushevicha v biblioteke Narodnogo doma v L'vove," *Vestnik Narodnogo doma* 30 (8) (1912), no. 1, pp. 6–11; no. 2, pp. 26–32; no. 3, pp. 34–40. The manuscripts covered are all held in fond 77, albeit with different code numbers. Some of the Petrushevych papers are now located in TsDIA-L, and a part of his manuscript collection is in the Library of the Academy of Sciences (BAN SSSR) in Leningrad.

newspaper editors Osyp Markov (1849–1909) and Volodymyr Shashkevych (1838–85); the journalist and philologist Henryk Polians'kyi (1847–1935); the philologist and professor of Ukrainian literature Hnat Onyshkevych (1847–83); the literary critic and cultural leader Vasyl' Koval's'kyi (1826–1911); the writer and cultural leader Mykola Ustiianovych (1811–85) and his son Kornylo (1839–1903), a writer and artist; the educator Oleksii Torons'kyi (1838–99); and the Slavicist and director of the National Home Library, Pylyp Svystun (1844–1916). Also well represented are the personal papers of Izydor Sharanevych (1829–1901), historian, archaeologist, and leader of the Stauropegial Institute; Iosyf Komarnyts'kyi (1852–1920), professor of theology and rector of Lviv University; and Spyrydon Lytvynovych (1810–69), metropolitan of Galicia. Some of the papers of Ilarion Svientsits'kyi (1876–1956), Slavicist and for many years director of the Ukrainian National Museum (now the Museum of Ukrainian Art) in Lviv, are part of the National Home collection, but others remain in family custody or among the institutional records of the museum itself.[28]

Many of the personal papers that came from the library of the National Home have since been classified as separate fonds in the manuscript division. Of particular note are the papers of the "Ruthenian Triad"—the poet Markiian Shashkevych (1811–43) (fond 142), the poet and philologist Iakiv Holovats'kyi (1814–88) (fond 36), and the historian and ethnographer Ivan Vahylevych (1811–66) (fond 19).[29] In the case of Shashkevych, a detailed catalogue recently issued by the library describes 81 of his literary manuscripts held by the division.[30] Other important leaders whose papers had been deposited in the National Home include the writer and political activist Rudol'f Mokh (1816–91) (fond 68),[31] the educator and political leader

[28] All of these groups of personal papers are described briefly in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*.

[29] See the survey of these papers by O. O. Dz'oban, "Arkhiv M. Shashkevycha, I. Vahylevycha ta Ia. Holovats'koho," *Bibliotekoznavstvo i bibliohrafiia na sluzhbi nauky*, pp. 146–56. Additional Holovats'kyi papers are to be found in Kiev—a large group in the Institute of Literature (fond 104) and others in the Central Scientific Library (TsNB) of the Academy of Sciences.

[30] *Rukopysy arkhivu M. S. Shashkevycha: Opys*, comp. O. O. Dz'oban, ed. Ie. Ie. Kravchenko (Lviv, 1979; [LNB AN]). Six of the manuscripts listed came from other fonds in the division.

[31] See the survey by O. O. Dz'oban, "Arkhiv Rudol'fa Mokha," *Arkhivy Ukrainy*, 1967, no. 6 (86), pp. 75–77.

Teofil' Pavlykiv (1821–1905) (fond 75), and the social and political activist Iustyn Zhelekhovs'kyi (1821–1900) (fond 47).[32]

The most important collection from Ukrainian religious institutions in the Lviv area came from the library of the Basilian monastery. Acquired by the Academy Library in 1940 and now grouped in the division as fond 3, the collection contains 972 early Slavic manuscript books dating from the fifteenth through the nineteenth centuries. These include the collection of the former St. Onufrius Monastery, along with those from other Basilian churches and monasteries in the area. These materials were brought together after the First World War, under the auspices of the Central Archive of the Order of St. Basil the Great (Tsentral'nyi vasyliians'kyi arkhiv). A survey of the manuscript collection by Iosafat Skruten' was published in 1928, and a catalogue of more detailed manuscript descriptions by Iaroslav Hordyns'kyi was published only in part before 1939.[33] However, the institutional

[32] See the report by P. I. Svystun on these papers, "Iz rukopisnogo nslediia po bl. p. Iustine Zhelekhovskom," *Vestnik Narodnogo doma,* 1909, no. 1, pp. 9–17; no. 2, pp. 23–31; no. 3, pp. 44–51; no. 4, pp. 65–97; no. 6, pp. 97–104; no. 7/8, pp. 128–44; no. 9, pp. 158–64; no. 10, pp. 166–71; no. 11, pp. 193–200; no. 12, pp. 205–10; 1910, no. 1, pp. 8–16; no. 2, pp. 25–28; no. 3, pp. 40–46; no. 4, pp. 54–59; no. 5, pp. 68–72; no. 6, pp. 82–88; no. 7/8, pp. 82–88; no. 9, pp. 127–34; no. 10, pp. 142–48; no. 11/12, pp. 160–63; 1912, no. 4, pp. 53–66; no. 5, pp. 70–75; no. 6, pp. 86–93; no. 7/8, pp. 109–14; and no. 9/10, pp. 121–22.

[33] See the survey description by I. Skruten', "Biblioteka l'vivs'kykh Vasyliian," *Analecta Ordinis Sancti Basilii Magni/ Zapysky Chyna sv. Vasyliia Velykoho* 1 (1924): 161–76; 3 (1928): 65–73. The first volume of the more detailed catalogue, comp. by Iaroslav Hordyns'kyi, *Rukopysy Biblioteky Monastyria sv. Onufriia ChSVV u L'vovi* (Zhovkva [now Nestorov], 1927), was originally published serially in the same journal; vol. 2 was only published serially, in ibid., 3, pt. 1–2 (1928): 40–64; 3, pt. 3–4 (1930): 345–76. The published part of the catalogue covers 69 manuscripts dating from the fifteenth through eighteenth centuries, but the system of numeration does not correspond to current code numbers, so correlations with present holdings are difficult. The completed manuscript of Hordyns'kyi's catalogue is now held in the manuscript division among his papers (as noted in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy,* p. 36), but unfortunately remains unpublished. A sketchy card catalogue of the Basilian collection is also available in the manuscript division. An early survey of the pre-nineteenth-century holdings by Iakiv Holovats'kyi (pseudonym Iaroslav Hotovats'kyi), "Korotka vidomost' o rukopysakh slavianskykh i ruskykh nakhodiashchykh sia v knyzhnytsi monastyria Sv. Vasyliia Vel. u L'vovi," in *Rusalka dnistrovaia* (Buda, 1837; fasc. ed., Kiev, 1972), pp. 122–29, listed 24 manuscripts, but due to imprecise descriptions, it has not been possible to correlate these with later catalogues.

archive of the St. Onufrius Monastery and other Basilian monasteries, including some of their manuscript books, is held in the historical archive in Lviv (TsDIA-L).

The former library of Count Wiktor Baworowski (1826–94), later open to the public as the Baworowski Library, had one of the richest manuscript collections in Lviv before 1939. It was taken over by the Academy Library in 1940. In addition to the original collection of Wiktor Baworowski, the library had acquired many important library and manuscript collections from the Lviv region, comprising personal papers, parchment documents, drawings, and autographs, as well as many valuable early Slavic manuscript books and collections of historical documents. Although a detailed catalogue of manuscripts in the Baworowski Library was prepared, it has never been published; it remains in manuscript in the Lviv library.[34] Some of the most valuable early manuscripts and individual parchments were among the materials evacuated by the Germans in 1944 and later recovered in Silesia. In fact 136 manuscripts from this collection, dating from the thirteenth through the twentieth centuries, including a copy of the First Lithuanian Statute, are now held by the National Library in Warsaw, where they were deposited after recovery in 1945.[35] An additional 31 historical manuscripts evacuated in 1944 from the Baworowski Library (dating from the years 1436–1848) are now held by the Main Archive of Early Acts in Warsaw, where they are listed in a manuscript inventory.[36] The vast majority of the collection, totaling 1,581 units, remains in the Academy Library in Lviv,

[34] Several descriptions of the library in its earlier configuration appeared in more general reference volumes in the 1920s. The most extensive early description was that by Wojciech Kętrzyński, *Biblioteka Wiktora hr. Baworowskiego we Lwowie* (Lviv, 1892; originally published in *Teka Konserwatorska* [vol. 1]).

[35] These Baworowski manuscripts are listed in the typescript inventory, "Wykaz rękopisów Biblioteki Baworowskich" (Warsaw, n.d.), available in the manuscript reading room of the Biblioteka Narodowa; they are also included in the card catalogue of manuscript division accessions with temporary accession numbers. Microfilm masters have been prepared from which copies may be ordered from the Biblioteka Narodowa.

[36] This collection is noted by Barbara Smoleńska and Teresa Zielińska, "Archiwalia prywatne w Archiwum Głównym Akt Dawnych w Warszawie (Drobne i szczątkowe zespoły i zbiory)," *Archeion* 39 (1963): 104–105. A separate inventory originally compiled by S. Szacherska in 1952, "Inwentarz Biblioteki Baworowskich z lat 1436–1848" (Warsaw, 1974), is available in the reading room in AGAD; it lists 31 items (nos. 246–78) with cross references to the original Lviv code numbers.

where it now constitutes fond 4 in the manuscript division. The collection still incorporates a variety of manuscript materials, including groups of personal papers and historical manuscript collections of important individuals from the Western Ukraine.[37]

Many of the early Slavic and some other manuscript books in the former Baworowski Library came from the collection of the early nineteenth-century Ukrainian historian Denys Zubryts'kyi (Zubrzycki; 1777–1862), which was given to the Baworowski Library after Zubryts'kyi's death. Included is a valuable collection of historical documentary materials (originals as well as copies) of sources dating from the sixteenth through the early nineteenth centuries. Much of Zubryts'kyi's correspondence and other personal papers were acquired with his manuscript book and documentary collection and are now held as part of the Baworowski Library collection; some of the Zubryts'kyi papers, however, came to the manuscript division as part of the library of NTSh (fond 1), the National Home (fond 2), and as individual acquisitions of the division (fond 9).[38]

Among other notable collections received by the Baworowski Library in its early years was part of the Stadnicki family collection, acquired in 1855 by the brothers Aleksander (1806–61) and Kazimierz (1808–86) Stadnicki. The following year, 120 manuscripts were received from the historian Ambroży Grabowski (1782–1868) of Cracow and 130 manuscripts from Kazimierz Stronczyński (1809–96) of Warsaw.[39] Additional collections were acquired from Leon Dembowski (1789–1878) and from Józef Karopatnicki (1766–1832) of Lipinek.

Several other groups of papers of cultural leaders came to the library and remain with the Baworowski collection. These include the papers of the his-

[37] The manuscript catalogue prepared before 1939 is still used as the basic finding aid in the division.

[38] Zubryts'kyi's archeographic activities and some of the manuscripts he collected are discussed by Ia. D. Isaievych, "D. I. Zubryts'kyi i ioho diial'nist' v haluzi spetsial'nykh dystsyplin," *Naukovo-informatsiinyi biuleten' Arkhivnoho upravlinnia URSR,* 1963, no. 1, pp. 48–53. A large group of Zubryts'kyi papers are located in TsDIA-L.

[39] A catalogue of the manuscripts received from Grabowski, prepared in 1855, is now held in the Ossolineum in Wrocław (MS 12151), along with catalogues of printed books in the Grabowski Library (MS 12150), and a list of illustrations, drawings, and albums (MS 12152). The Ossolineum also retains a manuscript list of the manuscripts in the Stronczyński collection prepared in 1848 (MS 2118). Individual manuscripts in these collections have subsequently been listed in Ossolineum catalogues.

torian, philologist, and archivist Walenty Majewski (or Skorochód-Majewski; 1764–1835), the historian Ignacy Chodynicki (1786–1847), the educator and literary critic Bolesław Baranowski (1844–1916), and the poet and geographer Wincenty Pol (1807–72). Also remaining there are the very extensive papers and manuscript collection of the historian, philologist, and theologian Bishop Alojzy Osiński (1770–1842), who taught for many years in Kremianets' before serving as the last rector of the Roman Catholic Ecclesiastical Academy in Vilnius (1833–39).[40] Many maps and drawings came to the library as part of the collection of Aleksander Batowski (1799–1862), but most of these are now housed in the graphic art division of the Academy Library.[41]

Among the richest groups of manuscript materials in the Academy Library are those that came from the Ossolineum, the largest library in Lviv before 1939 and, since its founding in 1817, the major center of Polish culture in Galicia.[42] A detailed scholarly catalogue of the first 1,504 manuscript units was prepared by the historian Wojciech Kętrzyński, the director of the library in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.[43] A summary inventory listing additional units from nos. 1505 to 6000 was issued in the mid 1930s, but only in a limited mimeographed edition.[44] Also, survey descriptions for a number of other component collections in the Ossolineum were published, and there were regular reports of manuscript acquisitions in the "kronika" section of the prominent historical journal *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, published in Lviv until 1939.[45]

40 These groups of papers are all mentioned briefly in the recent guide, *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*, and are listed as part of the Baworowski collection (fond 4).

41 See the cartographic materials cited in fn. 106.

42 See the survey history by Jan Trzynadlowski, issued in both Polish and French editions: *Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, 1817–1967: Zarys dziejów* (Wrocław, 1967), and *Institut national Ossolinski, 1817–1967: Précis d'histoire* (Wrocław, 1967).

43 Wojciech Kętrzyński, *Katalog rękopisów Biblioteki Zakładu Nar[odowego] im. Ossolińskich*, 3 vols. (Lviv, 1881–98).

44 *Inwentarz rękopisów Biblioteki Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich we Lwowie*, 2 vols. (Lviv, 1926–34).

45 Prewar descriptive publications are all listed in the comprehensive bibliography by Marian Górkiewicz, "Bibliografia dotycząca Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich (do r. 1939)," *Rocznik Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich* 4 (1953): 293–327. See the helpful survey of the holdings as of 1926 in the directory by Edward Chwalewik, *Zbiory polskie*, 2 vols. (Warsaw and Cracow, 1926–27), 1: 413–21.

After the establishment of Soviet rule in the Western Ukraine in 1939, the Ossolineum library was abolished as a separate institution (January 1940) and its collections amalgamated in the newly established Lviv branch of the Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Revived under the Nazi regime, the Ossolineum was again abolished with the reestablishment of Soviet rule in Lviv in 1944, and incorporated in the Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. In connection with postwar national, political, and territorial changes, the Ossolineum as an institution was reestablished in Wrocław, under the auspices of the Polish Academy of Sciences, and approximately half of its manuscripts remaining in Lviv were transferred to Wrocław in 1946 and 1947.[46] Another 1,451 manuscripts and 325 documents from the original Ossolineum collections, evacuated from Lviv in the spring of 1944 and recovered in Poland, were transferred to Wrocław from the National Library in Warsaw.[47] The Ossolineum manuscripts brought to Wrocław have all been thoroughly catalogued, including those previously included in the summary inventories of the 1920s and 1930s.[48] Similar catalogues, however, have not been forthcoming for manuscripts remaining in Lviv; not even surveys, summary inventories, or correlation tables are in print to advise researchers about contiguous manuscripts from the collection that remain in the Academy Library there. Hence, on the basis of information verified in Lviv and Wrocław, a brief survey of the holdings that remain in Lviv follows, with notes about collections now split between the two libraries.

Approximately 2,250 manuscript volumes from the original catalogued portion of the Ossolineum collection remain in Lviv, along with 609 separate documents (charters and diplomas from the years 1421–1930, including many on parchment) and more than 2,500 autographs dating from the eighteenth through early twentieth centuries. Many additional materials acquired

[46] The proportionate figure cannot be established precisely because many of the Ossolineum manuscripts had not been catalogued in Lviv and other collections had been accessioned by the Ossolineum in 1939–41 at the time it was being transformed into the Academy Library in Lviv.

[47] These figures come from official documents regarding the transfer from Warsaw in the institutional archive of the Ossolineum Library in Wrocław.

[48] *Inwentarz rękopisów Biblioteki Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich we Wrocławiu,* 6 vols. and index vol. (Wrocław, 1948–79); the first two volumes, edited by Jadwiga Turska (together with a separate index volume), cover the manuscripts transferred from Lviv; the second volume includes a reedition of the Gębarowicz catalogue of the Pawlikowski library (see fn. 64). Numbers for manuscripts remaining in Lviv are omitted from the Wrocław catalogues.

by the Ossolineum during its final years in Lviv which had not yet been catalogued also remain in Lviv. Unfortunately, the partitioning of manuscripts between Lviv and Wrocław was undertaken in tremendous haste, with little regard for the integrity of earlier collections. The official agreement between the Soviet Union and Poland provided that manuscripts specifically relating to Ukrainian history and culture, and particularly those relating to the area of Lviv, in whatever language, were to be retained in Lviv. As a result, many of the earlier integral Ossolineum collections have been split, making it difficult to use many of the materials concerned. Also, there have been no systematic provisions for exchanges of microfilms of the remaining manuscripts, although many of the Ossolineum manuscripts in Wrocław are available for public order through the microfilm sales program of the National Library in Warsaw.[49]

All of the manuscripts from the Ossolineum still in Lviv that had been catalogued before 1939 remain classified as an integrated institutional collection (fond 5). The many other collections and groups of personal and estate papers from the Ossolineum that remained in Lviv, but were not assigned catalogue numbers before the war, have now been separated out as distinctive fonds; many of these will be noted below. The original Ossolineum manuscripts had been assigned code numbers, clearly marked on their bindings, by which they were listed in earlier published catalogues and in the internal finding aids in the library; these original numbers have been retained in present internal cataloguing within the Ossolineum fond (the highest catalogue number in fond 5 in Lviv is 8093).[50] The same original numbering system is also still in use in Wrocław; hence the numbers for manuscripts remaining in Lviv—and a few that were lost during the war—are simply absent from the Wrocław catalogues. Since no new catalogues have been prepared in Lviv, Ossolineum manuscripts in Lviv can be identified *only* by reference to sequential numbers *missing* in the Wrocław catalogues. Once numbers missing from the Wrocław catalogue have been determined, detailed descriptions of manuscripts numbered between 1 and 1504 can be

[49] The published catalogues of microfilms available from the National Library, *Katalog mikrofilmów* [Biblioteka Narodowa, Dział zbiorów mikrofilmowych], vols. 3–6/7 (Warsaw, 1954–58), list a total of 1,921 Ossolineum manuscripts available on microfilm. Many additional microfilms have been prepared and are covered by card catalogues in the microfilm division of the National Library in Warsaw.

[50] Obviously, the code numbers for the Ossolineum fond in Lviv are no longer sequential, since there are now only 2,250 manuscript units in fond 5; items whose manuscript numbers are missing from the Lviv collection are now located in Wrocław.

found in Kętrzyński's three-volume Lviv catalogue (approximately 20 percent of them are now in Lviv). The titles of those manuscripts numbered between 1505 and 6000 that are still held in Lviv (approximately 30 percent), are listed in the two-volume mimeographed (1926–34) Lviv inventory. Copies of these earlier catalogues kept in the reading room in Lviv have been marked to indicate manuscript locations.

Among manuscripts in Lviv that appear in these published catalogues are scattered personal papers and parts of manuscript collections of the historian and librarian Stanisław Przyłęcki (1805–66), the Polish-Ukrainian poet Tymko Padura (1801–71), the orientalist and writer Wacław Rzewuski (pseudonym Emir Tadż el-Faher; 1785–1831), the medieval historian Stosław Łaguna (1833–1900), the historian Ludwik Kubala (1838–1918), the historian and director of the Ossolineum library August Bielowski (1806–76), and the politician and jurist Henryk Bogdański (1804–87).[51] The Wrocław catalogues show, however, that other parts of the personal papers or collections of these individuals are to be found in Wrocław.

In the case of the writer Wiktor Gomulicki (pseudonym Fantazy; 1848–1919), almost all of his papers once described in Lviv are now in Wrocław; only a few scattered manuscripts remain in Lviv.[52] The same is true of the papers of Bronisław Trentowski (1808–69), included in a description of 1926; the papers themselves have been transferred to Wrocław, but the autograph collection remains in Lviv.[53]

Most of the papers of members of the Mniszech family are now in

[51] Citations to the original Ossolineum numbers are given in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*. However, complete descriptions of individual manuscript volumes (i.e., nos. 1–1504) can be found in the earlier Kętrzyński catalogues (see fn. 43); those numbered 1505–6000 were only listed briefly by title in the inventories cited in fn. 44. Obviously these earlier catalogues remain essential as reference tools along with the 1977 survey guide.

[52] The well-indexed Wrocław catalogues list the contiguous manuscripts now located there. See the earlier description of the Gomulicki collection (nos. 5267–5434) by Kazimierz Tyszkowski, "Zbiór rękopisów Wiktora Gomulickiego w Bibliotece Narodowego Zakładu im. Ossolińskich we Lwowie," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 39 (1925): 317–21. As is apparent in the Wrocław catalogue, vol. 1, a few of the manuscripts remain in Lviv (5268, 5271, 5273, 5277–79, 5323, 5347–49, 5355–56, 5370, 5388, 5397, 5406, 5409–14, 5416–17), although they are not listed in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*.

[53] Of the manuscripts described by Tadeusz Lutman ("Rękopisy Bronisława Trentowskiego w Zakładzie Narodowym im. Ossolińskich we Lwowie," *Ruch Literacki*, 1926, no. 6, pp. 178–80) nos. 3265, 4745, and 4908 are now in Wrocław, as are autographs 2699–2701; however, autograph 2743 remains in LNB AN.

Wrocław (nos. 2617–2708, 3550–82, 3928–73, 5642–51, and 8041–44), although a few apparently remain in Lviv. Some of the earliest papers, including the correspondence of Józef Mniszech (1670–1747), were purchased by the Ossolineum in 1854 and surveyed in an article published in 1878.[54] A recent survey has mentioned some papers of the Ossoliński family (1515–1791), the Stadnicki family (1580–1791), and Aleksander Cetner (d. 1688) that are held in Lviv (others have been transferred to Wrocław).[55] Although not covered by the pre-1939 Lviv inventory, many of the manuscripts in the Chrzanowski collection had been listed in a description published in the 1920s and assigned catalogue numbers in the Ossolineum in Lviv. Most of this collection (nos. 6137–6190), based principally on the nineteenth-century collection of Edward Chrzanowski (1843–1922), was transferred intact to Wrocław (a few items remain in LNB AN).[56]

Approximately half of the rich Lubomirski family archive, with documentation from 1781 to 1869, remains in Lviv (scattered nos. between 6001 and 6057); part of it was described in a catalogue prepared by Stefan Inglot. The other half of the papers (including scattered additional manuscripts to 6106) are listed in the new Wrocław catalogue. Some additional Lubomirski manuscripts from the Kruszyna estate are also listed in the Wrocław catalogue (between nos. 8077 and 8091); others from the Kruszyna collection remain

54 See Klemens Kantecki, "Z archiwum Mniszchów," *Ateneum: Pismo Naukowe i Literackie* 4 (12), no. 2 (November 1878): 259–90; no. 3 (December 1878): 529–92 (later published in *Szkice i opowiadania* [Poznań, 1883], pp. 292–356). Numbers missing from the first volume of the Wrocław catalogue—and hence in Lviv—include nos. 2657, 3931, 3937–40, 3942–47, and 3950–70, but there is no listing for the Mniszech papers in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*. Other Mniszech papers are located in the Central State Historical Archive of the Ukrainian SSR in Kiev.

55 Michał Wąsowicz, "Materiały do dziejów Polski w Centralnych Historycznych Archiwach Państwowych we Lwowie i Kijowie," *Archeion* 33 (1960): 117. However, some of the catalogue numbers cited by Wąsowicz do not coincide with the published catalogues. In the case of the Cetner papers nos. 3642–46 are indeed in Lviv, while the contiguous manuscripts (nos. 3647–49) are listed in the Wrocław catalogue.

56 Kazimierz Tyszkowski, *Biblioteka Chrzanowskich w Moroczynie* (Cracow, 1925), pp. 15–20, lists 44 manuscripts in the collection. In the sequence of numbers in the Wrocław catalogue, nos. 6145, 6149, and 6155 are missing, and hence presumably remain in Lviv. Parts of Tyszkowski's account were originally published in *Silva Rerum,* 1925, no. 4, pp. 4–8, and in *Przewodnik Bibliograficzny,* 1925, no. 2, pp. 78–79.

in Lviv (nos. 8083–85, 8089, and 8093).[57] The Academy Library in Lviv retains most of the papers from the Kossowa estate (near Wadowice) of the family of Aleksander Wybranowski, including some papers of the Żydowski family (nos. 6556–82). These had been described briefly in 1874, when they were still held on the family estate.[58]

The Ossolineum had acquired a large part of the rich archive and library of the Lviv Armenian cathedral chapter in 1866. The collection, which had been described earlier, included a large group of parchment documents along with many manuscript books.[59] Approximately one-third of the collection as described in 1835, along with later Lviv Armenian manuscripts, was transferred to Vienna in the late nineteenth century, where it is still held by the Mechitarist Library. Of the two-thirds of the collection deposited in the Ossolineum, approximately half was transferred to Wrocław after World War II. Thus only one-third of the original collection now remains in Lviv. The haphazard apportionment of this collection of Lviv provenance and pertinence well illustrates the lack of logic—and for researchers, the frustrating consequences—of the division of the original Ossolineum holdings in Lviv.[60]

The perplexing problems arising from groups of materials being divided

[57] The Inglot catalogue, *Inwentarz Archiwum XX. Lubomirskich: Linia Dąbrowieńska* (Warsaw, 1937), covers the original Ossolineum numbers 6001–19. See the Wrocław catalogue (vol. 1) for additional listings to 6106. Those remaining in Lviv are numbers 6001, 6031–33, 6035, 6036, 6039–49, and 6052–57. For the Kruszyna manuscripts, see the Wrocław catalogue, vol. 2, nos. 8077–91.

[58] Aleksander Wybranowski, "Archiwum kossowskie," *Przewodnik Naukowy i Literacki* 2 (1874, no. 2): 168–71, 272–78. However, this collection is not mentioned in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*.

[59] See the early description of the Armenian collection by Sadok Barącz, "O rękopisach kapituły ormiańskiej lwowskiej," *Dziennik Literacki*, 1835, nos. 34–37, 39–40.

[60] See the listings by Frédéric Macler, "Rapport sur un mission scientifique en Galicie et en Bukovine (juillet-août 1925)," *Revue des études arméniennes* 8 (1927): 79–94. For the fate of Lviv Armenian manuscripts before World War II, see the two articles by Tadeusz Mańkowski, "Archiwum lwowskiej katedry ormiańskiej," *Archeion* 10 (1932): 1–11, and "Sztuka ormian lwowskich," *Prace Komisii Historii Sztuki* (Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności) 6, pt. 1 (1934): 136–60. For the Wrocław holdings see the scattered, but well-indexed references in vol. 1 of the new Wrocław catalogue. Although MS 7081 is listed as Zaleski papers vols. III–VI, vols. III, IV, and VI are indicated as missing; probably one or more of these volumes also remains in Lviv, which may account for its listing in the Lviv survey.

between Lviv and Wrocław are also evident with groups of family or personal papers accessioned in Lviv before 1939 but not then covered by published descriptions. In Lviv remain significant portions of the papers of the Zaleski family (1806–1929) (nos. 7079–7137 passim) and the Repnin family (1764–1911) (nos. 6682–84, 6688–6703 passim), while the rest of the contiguous manuscripts are in Wrocław. The Ossolineum collection in Lviv includes many of the papers of the geologist and publicist Michał Łempicki (1855–1930) (nos. 6871–6920 passim) and of the historian and philologist Antoni Małecki (1821–1913) (nos. 6301–15), as well as most of the papers of the historian and ethnographer Edward Rulikowski (1809–1900) (nos. 7352–7446). Also in Lviv are scattered papers of the economist and banker Jan Rozwadowski (1872–1935) (nos. 8014–19), although the bulk of the Rozwadowski family archive is in Wrocław (nos. 7916–8021 passim); the economist and publicist Tadeusz Romanowicz (1843–1904) (nos. 4574, 6822–27 passim); the early nineteenth-century Polish officer Julian Hohendorf (nos. 7284–87); the Darowski family, including Mieczysław Darowski (1810–89); the historian Aleksander Darowski (1815–74) (nos. 6794–6809 passim); and the director of the Lviv municipal theater Ludwik Heller (1865–1926) (nos. 6817–19).

All of these groups of papers are mentioned in the recent Lviv survey guide, which at the end of the listing provides the orginal Ossolineum numbers for the items remaining in Lviv.[61] By contrast, the more complete Wrocław catalogues provide volume-by-volume listings, with concise descriptions of manuscript contents. Hence the researcher should be advised to turn to the Wrocław catalogue for more information about collections that have been split. For example, for the Zaleski papers the Lviv guide starts with the numbers 7079–84; since number 7081 is identified in the Wrocław catalogue as Zaleski papers, vols. III–VI, one can presume that vols. I and II are in Lviv, as are vols. VII–XI (since the Wrocław catalogue picks up again with no. 7085 [vol. XII]). Since nos. 7095 and 7096 are the next numbers listed in Lviv (and missing from Wrocław), one can presume that vols. XXXIV–XXXIX are in Lviv, for the Wrocław catalogue picks up again with 7097 (Zaleski papers, vol. XL). The same pattern continues through the rest of the collection, the bulk of which is in Lviv (nos. 7098–99, 7101, 7103, 7105, 7111, 7115–34, and 7136–37); the intervening catalogue numbers of the Zaleski papers, and the intervening volume numbers previously assigned to them, are all listed with their contents in the Wrocław catalogue.[62]

[61] *Osobysti arkhivni fondy,* passim.

[62] *Osobysti arkhivni fondy,* pp. 54–56; *Inwentarz rękopisów Biblioteki ZNiO we Wrocławiu,* 1: 532–36.

Some other major groups of materials acquired by the Ossolineum before 1939 and assigned catalogue numbers in Lviv, but not included in the Lviv published inventories, have been transferred almost in full to Wrocław. As mentioned above, the bulk of the archive of the Rozwadowski family (nos. 7916–8021) is in Wrocław, as are practically all of the papers of Oswald Balzer (1858–1933) (nos. 7659–7801). The same is true of the papers of the Polish Society of Friends of the Arts (Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Sztuk Pięknych we Lwowie) (nos. 7447–7617).[63] The 361 manuscript units of the Wodzicki family archive from Kościelniki (Archiwum Wodzickich z Kościelnik) (nos. 11570–11930), purchased by the Ossolineum just before the war, were transferred intact to Wrocław.

Several groups of major family and estate papers also remaining in Lviv, acquired by the Ossolineum before 1939 but not included in its sequentially numbered published catalogues, have now been classified as separate fonds in the Academy Library. The Gwalbert Pawlikowski library, formerly housed in the Ossolineum, had been catalogued as a separate collection and described by Mieczysław Gębarowicz before the war. From this collection 235 manuscript books and many parchments were transferred to Wrocław, where relevant parts of the earlier catalogue covering them have been reissued. The remaining 55 manuscripts still in Lviv covered by the earlier catalogue, together with other parts of the Pawlikowski collection, now constitute a separate fond (fond 76).[64]

From the extensive manuscript collection of the historian Aleksander Czołowski (1865–1944), 2,500 manuscript volumes were presented to the Ossolineum in Lviv in 1936 and an additional 25 volumes in 1939; however, these were not integrated into the Ossolineum catalogue or numbering system there. The collection consisted of a wide variety of historical documents—both originals and copies, including those from civic, juridical, ecclesiastical and private sources—relating to the history of Galicia from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries.[65] Of this collection 1,062 man-

63 None of these collections are mentioned in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy,* although scattered manuscript volumes are missing from the coverage in the Wrocław catalogue, vol. 2.

64 The Gębarowicz catalogue, *Katalog rękopisów Biblioteki im. Gwalberta Pawlikowskiego* (Lviv, 1929), has been reissued as part of the general Wrocław Ossolineum catalogue, vol. 2, omitting the coverage of the 55 manuscripts remaining in Lviv. Some of the early documents in the Pawlikowski collection were listed in the Pohorecki catalogue cited in fn. 84.

65 The 2,525 manuscripts presented to the Ossolineum in 1936 and 1939 are listed in the typewritten "Inwentarz rękopisów dyr. dra Aleksandra Czołowskiego ofiarowanych do Zakładu Narodowego imienia Ossolińskich" (Lviv, 1936, 1939; 120 pp.),

uscript units, dating from the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries, remain in Lviv, where they have been classified as fond 141. Another 266 manuscript units from the Czołowski collection are now in the Ossolineum in Wrocław, where they are covered by the new catalogue (nos. 9501–9766).[66] The collection in Lviv is particularly rich in feudal inventories from estates in the former Polish palatinates of Ruthenia and Podolia.[67] Most of Czołowski's personal papers and parts of his manuscript collection from Lviv remained in his possession until his death in 1944. During the Second World War they were evacuated from Lviv to the abbey of Tyniec near Cracow. Later they were presented by his family to the National Library in Warsaw, where they are now listed in several volumes of the published catalogues.[68] The more valuable archival part of the Czołowski collection in Warsaw, including documentation from as early as the fifteenth century, with some valuable parchments, was subsequently transferred to the Main Archive of Early Acts (AGAD), where it remains today.[69]

---

available in the National Library in Warsaw (MS 5543). A manuscript card file covering 399 manuscripts (MS 5542) is also held there. Numbers correlating with those in the typewritten list appear on the back of each card. These catalogues have not been correlated with parts of the collection listed in later inventories, including the ones published in Wrocław.

66 The Wrocław catalogue, 2: 146–85, lists the Czołowski manuscripts, but does not correlate them with the 1936/39 Czołowski typescript catalogue prepared in Lviv. For those items in Wrocław it is apparent that the arrangement, including division into manuscript units, differs from that in the 1936/39 inventory; this would account for the discrepancy between the 2,525 Czołowski manuscripts in Lviv in 1939 and the totals listed today of 1,062 in Lviv and 266 in Wrocław. Insofar as can be determined, none of the Czołowski manuscripts presented to the Ossolineum in Lviv in 1936/39 are now in Warsaw.

67 No published description is available of the Czołowski collection in Lviv and it is not even mentioned in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*. Although presumably over one-half of the collection remains in Lviv, its general contents can be determined by reference to the typescript catalogue in the National Library in Warsaw, omitting those items listed in the published Wrocław catalogue. This collection had not been assigned Ossolineum numbers in Lviv before the Second World War; hence, it is not possible to determine code numbers for the materials remaining in Lviv, since no numbers are missing in the numerical sequence in the Wrocław catalogue. Although verification has not been possible, it would appear that the numbering system from the 1936/39 inventory in Warsaw is still used for the Czołowski collection in LNB AN.

68 The Czołowski papers and related manuscript collection are described in detail in *Katalog rękopisów Biblioteki Narodowej*, vols. 4–7 (Warsaw, 1955–69), passim.

69 See the brief description of the Czołowski collection in AGAD by Barbara Smoleńska and Teresa Zielińska, "Archiwalia prywatne w AGAD," *Archeion* 39

In contrast to those collections which were transferred (wholly or in part) to Wrocław, several other important groups of family and estate materials remain relatively complete in Lviv. All of the rich archive from the Krasiczyn estate (near Przemyśl) of the Sapieha family, with materials dating from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries, presented to the Ossolineum in 1910 but never described in print, is now a separate fond (fond 103) in the Academy Library.[70] A large archive from the Jabłonowski family estate in Burshtyn (Pol. Bursztyn, now in Ivano-Frankivs'k oblast) had been acquired by the Ossolineum in the early twentieth century, but again had not been included in the published catalogue. A separate manuscript inventory of this archive—and several related family collections—is now available in the manuscript division of the National Library in Warsaw, but a published description has never appeared.[71] Many other Jabłonowski family papers have been catalogued as part of the Ossolineum collection, but the major portion have now been grouped separately as fond 145. Another part of the

---

(1963): 102–103. A typewritten summary inventory prepared in 1949 by Piotr Bańkowski is available in the reading room in AGAD: "Spis archiwaliów ze zbioru Al. Czołowskiego przekazanych przez Bibliotekę Narodową wydziałowi Archiwów Państwowych" (Warsaw, 1949). Of the 191 items listed with cross-references to the original numbers (all in the 3000s), six are now marked as missing, and the parchments from the collection have been transferred to the separate parchment section in AGAD. A more detailed inventory of the collection is now in preparation in AGAD, but the new code numbers assigned are still only provisional.

[70] There is no published description of the Sapieha collection as presently constituted in LNB AN, nor is it mentioned in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*. Of some help to researchers, however, is the unpublished inventory of the collection of Władysław Sapieha from the family estate in Krasiczyn as it was when it was presented to the Ossolineum: "Spis przedmiotów, znalezionych w pięciu skrzyniach, wywiezonych z Przemyśla, a oddanych w depozyt Zakładowi Narodowemu im. Ossolińskich we Lwowie, jako własność księcia Władysława Sapiehy, właściciela zamku w Krasiczynie." The inventory is available among the Czołowski papers in the National Library in Warsaw (MS 5540, pt. 1, folios 213–22).

[71] An undated typescript inventory of the Jabłonowski family archive from Burshtyn is held as part of the Czołowski collection in the National Library in Warsaw: "Inwentarz (tymczasowy) Archiwum XX. Jabłonowskich z Bursztyna" (5540, pt. 1, folios 55–78). In addition to the Jabłonowski archive itself, which is listed as the fourth section, the inventory includes coverage of the archives of Paweł Benoe (d. 1755), the Skarbek family, and Juliana (née Skarbek) and Franciszek Rzewuski. It has not been possible to correlate this inventory with the correct arrangement of holdings in LNB AN.

Jabłonowski family and estate archives is now held by the historical archive in Lviv (TsDIA-L).

Three other large family and estate collections have been at least partially surveyed in print. A large part of the rich archive of the Borch family from Vaŗakļāni (Pol. Warklany; near Rēzekne, now in the Latvian SSR), which was surveyed briefly in 1930, now constitutes fond 13 in LNB AN. An additional part of that archive is now held by AGAD in Warsaw.[72] The archive from the Bereh estate (near Dubno in Volhynia, now Rovno oblast) of the Luba-Radzimiński family had been acquired by the Ossolineum after the First World War. Although never included in the Ossolineum's published catalogues, the collection had been described earlier in an article by Przemysław Dąbkowski.[73] A supplemental inventory of the collection was later prepared in Lviv; a carbon of that typescript is now available in the Czołowski collection in AGAD in Warsaw.[74] The archive, broug ht together by the Polish historian Zygmunt Radzimiński (1843–1928), remains almost entirely in Lviv, including a collection of originals, copies, and summaries of important historical documents from Volhynia. Some of these materials were recently described by the historian M. P. Koval's'kyi.[75]

72 Tadeusz Lutman, "Archiwum Borchów z Warklan," *Archeion* 6/7 (1930): 64–66. Some of these materials had been evacuated to Russia during the First World War and revindicated, then later deposited in Lviv after the war. The part of the estate archive now in AGAD is mentioned by Smoleńska and Zielińska, "Archiwalia prywatne w AGAD," *Archeion* 39 (1963): 98; it is covered in the typewritten inventory in AGAD prepared by Jolanta Dobrucka, "Inwentarz Archiwum dóbr Warklany z lat 1777–1915" (Warsaw, 1970), which includes a brief introduction regarding the history of the collection.

73 See the early general description of the archive by Przemysław Dąbkowski, *Archiwum berehskie Luba-Radzimińskich obecnie we Lwowie (opis konserwatorsko-archiwalny)* (Lviv, 1919), originally published in *Przewodnik Naukowy i Literacki,* 1918, pp. 1119–51. Most of the 37 parchments listed *(Archiwum,* pp. 22–28) are held with the rest of the fond in Lviv.

74 "Inwentarz prowizoryczny archiwum berehskie Luba-Radzimińskich w Zakładzie Narodowym im. Ossolińskich we Lwowie" (AGAD, Zbiór Czołowskiego, 415 [3233]; 59 pp.). The inventory provides cross-references to materials covered by the Dąbkowski article.

75 The article by M. P. Koval's'kyi (N. P. Koval'skii), "Dokumental'nye kollektsii Radzimin'skogo i Ossolin'skogo kak istochniki po istorii Volyni XV–XVIII vv.," in *Nekotorye problemy otechestvennoi istoriografii i istochnikovedeniia: Sbornik nauchnykh trudov* (Dnipropetrovs'k, 1978), pp. 25–34, lists some of the copies from early court records available in the collection, along with related documents in the Ossolineum fond.

Another important group of historical materials came to the Ossolineum with the collection of Włodzimierz Kozłowski (1858–1917), the noted Galician political leader. Along with Kozłowski's personal papers were over 480 notebooks containing materials relating to the history of Galicia from the seventeenth to the early twentieth century. This collection now constitutes fond 59, which also includes many of Kozłowski's personal papers.[76]

Many of the revealing notebooks of the nineteenth-century historian and geographer Antoni Schneider (1825–80) were acquired by the Ossolineum, without being included in its published catalogues. The Schneider notebooks are particularly important sources for the local history of Galicia, as is apparent in a recent survey of the materials remaining in LNB AN (fond 144).[77] An inventory of 222 Schneider notebooks held by the Ossolineum before 1939 is available in the National Library in Warsaw.[78] An even larger group of Schneider notebooks are to be found in the State Provincial Archive in Cracow,[79] and an additional notebook has been identified in AGAD in Warsaw.[80]

The rich library of the Dzieduszycki family estate was moved from Potorytsia (Pol. Poturzyca, now in Lviv oblast) to Lviv in 1857.[81] Usually known as the Potorytsia Library (Biblioteka Poturzycka), it remained a sepa-

76 The extensive Kozłowski collection is described briefly in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*, pp. 72–76 (the figure of 200,000 units reported must be a typographical error), but no more detailed coverage has appeared.

77 The Schneider notebooks in LNB AN have been described by Ia. R. Dashkevych (pseudonym S. Piskovyi), "L'vivs'ki 'teky' A. Schneidera iak istoryko-kraieznavche dzherelo," *Arkhivy Ukrainy*, 1965, no. 4, pp. 73–76.

78 The inventory of the Schneider collection came to the National Library as part of the Czołowski collection: "Teki Antoniego Schneidra w Zakładzie Narodowym im. Ossolińskich we Lwowie" (MS 5540, pt. 2, folios 223–30). It is obvious from the Dashkevych article that the collection now in LNB AN is still organized as it was when that inventory was prepared.

79 The collection of Schneider notebooks, including 282 archival units, in Cracow (Wojewódzkie Archiwum Państwowe w Krakowie) is covered in a typewritten inventory, "Spis Tek Antoniego Schneidera." See additional data about the Schneider collection in a review of the Dashkevych article by Adam Kamiński in *Archeion* 45 (1966): 238–40.

80 The Schneider notebook in AGAD, entitled "Kościoły ze Zołkiecz (materiały i notaty)," is held as part of the Czołowski collection (Zbiór Czołowskiego, 364 [3168]).

81 A list of manuscripts from the Potorytsia Library (near the town of Sakol, now in Lviv oblast) prepared around 1850, before its transfer to Lviv, is now held in the Ossolineum in Wrocław (MS 1839).

rate library open to the public in Lviv and continued to be enlarged. It was acquired by the Ossolineum in 1939, together with the family archive. Although never assigned Ossolineum catalogue numbers in Lviv, its holdings were integrated with the Ossolineum collections during the 1940–41 period and then later divided. A large part of this collection was transferred to Wrocław as part of the Ossolineum and has since been included in the catalogue there (nos. 9767–9924).[82] Some 185 items from the Dzieduszycki collection remain in the Academy Library in Lviv (fond 45), but without a description in print. Nineteen manuscripts from this collection that were removed by the Germans in 1944 and retrieved in Poland in 1945 are now held by the National Library in Warsaw.[83] Large parts of the Dzieduszycki estate archives are now held by TsDIA-L.

Original parchment and paper documents (charters, diplomas, etc.) had been catalogued separately from other manuscript holdings in the Ossolineum, and numbered 2,215 units by 1939. Most of those predating 1506, which had been carefully described in the 1937 catalogue prepared by Felix Pohorecki, were transferred to Wrocław, either directly after the war or earlier through the German evacuation in spring 1944. Only a very few of these early documents from the original Ossolineum collection remain in Lviv.[84] Additional catalogues have been prepared in Wrocław covering post-1506 documents (up to 1939), including 1,498 which were transferred from Lviv (with inventory numbers to 2304).[85] Unfortunately there is no published catalogue of the 609 documents (dating from the years 1421–1930) remaining in the Ossolineum collection in Lviv.

The extensive autograph collection of the Ossolineum was also maintained in a separately numbered catalogue system, although a catalogue was

82 For the Wrocław holdings, see vol. 2 of the catalogue published there.

83 These nineteen manuscripts are listed in the typescript inventory, "Wykaz rękopisów Biblioteki Poturzyckiej Dzieduszyckich" (Warsaw, n.d.), available in the manuscript reading room of the National Library.

84 Of the 287 documents covered by the prewar catalogue—Felix Pohorecki, *Catalogus diplomatum Bibliothecae Instituti Ossoliniani nec non Bibliothecae Pawlikowianae inde ab anno 1227 usque ad annum 1506* (Lviv, 1937)—only five (Pohorecki nos. 69, 218, 226, 243, and 273) remain in Lviv. The supplement to this catalogue, prepared in Wrocław by Adam Fastnacht, *Catalogus diplomatum Bibliothecae Instituti Ossoliniani: Supplementum I. Inde ab anno 1279 usque ad annum 1506* (Wrocław, 1951), includes only eleven documents that came from Lviv.

85 Adam Fastnacht, *Katalog dokumentów Biblioteki Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich*, 2 vols. (Wrocław, 1953–69).

never published.[86] Autographs in this collection numbered 5,289 by 1925, and the number was significantly larger by 1939. This collection has also been split between Lviv and Wrocław.

Apart from the Ossolineum manuscript collections remaining in LNB AN, the library retains the rich institutional records of the Ossolineum itself in Lviv from before 1940. These records naturally constitute a fundamental source for cultural history in the Lviv area, and especially for the Polish culture flourishing in Galicia. This major body of records is not now part of the Ossolineum collection (fond 5), but rather is part of the institutional archive of LNB AN. The manuscript division of the LNB AN has a separate fond for many of the files of the Ossolineum publishing house in Lviv, dating from the years 1919–39. These files are covered by a card catalogue in the manuscript division reading room.

When the Academy Library in Lviv took over the library of the Theological Academy in 1940, it acquired another important collection of Greek Catholic (Ukrainian/Ruthenian Uniate) manuscripts. These holdings, numbering only 173 manuscripts, are not as significant as those of the Basilian collection, but nevertheless include many important religious materials dating from the sixteenth through nineteenth centuries. They are now grouped as fond 6 in the manuscript division, but have never been described in a published catalogue.

Many of the Roman Catholic monastic library collections from the Lviv area have been dispersed. However, part of the manuscript collection of the Bernardine monastery in Lviv remains in the Academy Library as fond 8, without ever having been described in a published account.[87] Other Bernardine manuscripts from Lviv were transferred to Poland and are now held in the archive of the Bernardine Order in Cracow.[88]

For many years since 1940, the library has grouped its own miscellaneous

86 See the nineteenth-century survey by Klemens Kantecki, "Z autografów Zakładu Nar. im. Ossolińskich," in *Szkice i opowiadania* (Poznań, 1883), pp. 373–411.

87 The directory by E. Chwalewik, *Zbiory polskie,* 1: 384, indicates some of the prewar manuscript riches of the Bernardine monastery, but it has not been possible to verify the current holdings in LNB AN.

88 See the listings of materials from Lviv in the catalogue prepared by H. E. Wyczawski, "Katalog Archiwum Prowincji OO. Bernardynów w Krakowie," *Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne* 3, pt. 1/2 (1961): 25–102; 4 (1962): 23–225; and 5 (1962): 13–210.

manuscript acquisitions in a special collection *Okremi nadkhodzhennia*—ON (fond 9), which is now one of the largest and richest collections in the division, with a wide variety of documentary materials. Recently, some groups of personal papers have been separated out from this collection and assigned separate fond numbers. As of 1978 the collection numbered over 2,000 units.

In addition to those already mentioned, the division has acquired other lesser groups of institutional records. Of special note is the archive of the Polish Galician Agricultural Society (Galicyjskie Towarzystwo Gospodarskie; 1849–1909), which now constitutes fond 125, with nearly a thousand units. There is also a small group of papers and illustrative materials from the agency devoted to the preservation of antiquities in Eastern Galicia (Koło C. K. Konserwatorów Zabytków Starożytnych Galicji Wschodniej; 1866–1939).[89]

Some library-type materials dating from the 1920s and 1930s were acquired from Lviv University, most notably a collection of manuscript theses. Other manuscript materials from the university remain in the manuscript division of the University Library in Lviv, whereas the archival records of the university and related manuscripts are held by the Lviv Oblast State Archive (LODA).[90]

The Academy Library has a few scattered records of interest from publishing houses in Lviv, in addition to the files of the Ossolineum press mentioned above. The editorial records of the Polish newspaper *Sygnały* from the 1930s were acquired by the manuscript division, but apparently are no longer available there. Some materials relating to newspapers and journals in Lviv are among the personal papers of publicists and cultural leaders associated with the publications, such as the Barvins'kyi papers mentioned earlier.[91] However, most of the institutional records of publishing houses,

[89] These are covered in a card file in the manuscript division catalogue room. Some other papers from this society are to be found among the Czołowski collection in the National Library in Warsaw; see *Katalog rękopisów Biblioteki Narodowej*, vol. 5, passim.

[90] There is no published description of manuscript holdings in the University Library, but these will be surveyed in my forthcoming directory. For coverage of materials from the university archives, see the guide, *LODA: Putivnyk*, pp. 113–32, and the earlier inventory by Ludwik Finkel, *Inwentarz Archiwum Universytetu Lwowskiego* (Lviv, 1917; "Materiały do historii Uniwersytetu Lwowskiego," vol. 1).

[91] See fn. 22.

newspapers, and journals in Lviv are now held by the state oblast archive or the historical archive (TsDIA-L).[92]

A number of estate archives of early aristocratic families in Galicia remain in the division. Among the most important not yet mentioned here is the archive of the Potocki estates from Łancut and elsewhere in Galicia (fond 84), with materials dating from the years 1853–1939.[93] The estate archives of the Jabłonowski, Luba-Radzimiński, Dzieduszycki, and Sapieha families were mentioned above because these archives were originally held by the Ossolineum before 1940. Now these archives have been classified as separate fonds of the manuscript division; they all await detailed published descriptions.

The estate archive of the Galician Uniate metropolia (Tsentral'na kantseliariia stolovykh maietkiv halyts'koi mytropolii) is only partially preserved in the Academy Library (fond 113). Its materials date from 1781 to 1939, but documentation is especially extensive for the early nineteenth century, particularly for the tenure of Metropolitan Mykhailo Cardinal Levyts'kyi (1774–1858; metropolitan 1815–58). The larger part of the archive is now housed in TsDIA-L, although twentieth-century holdings predominate there.[94]

The manuscript division now holds the personal papers—or significant portions thereof—of well over two hundred individuals. As discussed above, many are still part of the institutional collections with which they were acquired and previously catalogued, or in the collection of miscellaneous acquisitions (fond 9). Brief descriptions of 176 groups of personal and family papers are included in the recently published guide to personal papers in the division, but unfortunately, a number of others, particularly those associated with large estate archives, are not.[95]

92 See *LODA: Putivnyk,* passim, which lists records available there. Most of the relatively small files in LNB AN are covered by the card catalogues in the manuscript division. Some of these publication records came to LNB AN as part of the manuscript collections from the Ossolineum, the National Home, and the NTSh, but are now classified as separate fonds.

93 E. M. Humeniuk, "Arkhiv Potots'kykh," *Naukovo-informatsiinyi biuleten' Arkhivnoho upravlinnia URSR,* 1963, no. 4, pp. 57–65.

94 E. M. Humeniuk, "Arkhiv stolovykh maietkiv halyts'koi mytropolii," *Arkhivy Ukrainy,* 1970, no. 1, pp. 68–72. The fond in TsDIA-L contains 1,600 units dating from the years 1656–1942.

95 *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*. Obviously, only a fraction of those listed can be mentioned in the present survey. Many of the 176 groups mentioned above do not constitute separate fonds, but form part of institutional collections.

Many of the most important groups of papers of Polish leaders in Lviv came to LNB AN from the Ossolineum and the Baworowski Library, but others with different provenance merit attention. Among the archives of Polish scholars (mainly historians) who specialized in Ukrainian or Galician subjects are those of Franciszek Bujak (1875–1953) (fond 18); Łucja Charewiczowa (1876–1943) (fond 136); Adam Lutman (1908–42) (fond 65); Tadeusz Lutman (1903–45) (still grouped with the manuscript division collection, fond 9); Antoni Prochaska (1852–1930) (fond 87); and Kazimierz Tyszkowski (1894–1940) (fond 116).[96]

Extensive documentary materials dating back to the seventeenth century are among the papers of the architect Leopold Rais (1889–1944) (fond 92) and the literary critic and editor Ludwik Zieliński (1808–1873) (fond 52).[97] The papers of Józef Tomasik (1860–ca. 1938) and his son (fond 118; fond 9) include a large collection of autographs and manuscripts, as well as personal papers relating to the Tomasik antiquarian book and manuscript trade in Lviv. Also of note are the papers of the Polish journalist and literary critic Ostap Ortwin (1876–1942) (pseudonym of Oskar Katzenellenbogen) (fond 73).

One should mention the family archives of some important Polish Galician politicians during the period of Austrian rule, such as the Gołuchowski (fond 37), Pilat (fond 78), and Smolka (part of fond 9) families. Also notable are the papers of General Józef Dwernicki (1779–1857) (fond 43), and of the political leader and law professor Leon Piniński (1857–1938) (fond 79).[98] The papers of the Polish Galician socialist leader Herman Diamand (1860–1931) (fond 44) have been described separately.[99]

Among the legacies of Ukrainian cultural leaders not mentioned above in connection with the NTSh and the National Home are the papers of the composers Mykola Lysenko (1842–1912), Zynovii Lys'ko (1895–1976), and

96 These are all listed in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*. The Charewiczowa collection is described in more detail by Stanisław Franciszek Gajerski, "Źródła do dziejów południowowschnodniej Polski w bibliotekach i archiwach Lwowa," *Studia Historyczne* 20 (1977, no. 2 [77]): 298–300.

97 The Zieliński collection was described briefly by Władysław Zieliński, "Zbiory archiwalne śp. Ludwika Zielińskiego we Lwowie," *Wiadomości Bibliograficzne Warszawskie*, 1882, pp. 68–70, 104–105; at the time of that description, the materials were still in the custody of the family. The 22 parchments (1234–1633) listed then are no longer held as part of the collection in LNB AN.

98 Brief mention of these holdings also appear in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*.

99 Tadeusz Sierocki, "Archiwum Hermana Diamanda w Lwowskiej Bibliotece Publicznej," *Z Pola Walki* 7, no. 3 (1964): 245–51.

Kyrylo Stetsenko (1882–1922), all found in fond 9 as part of the general collection of LNB AN. The papers of the philologist, literary historian, and academician Mykhailo Vozniak (1881–1954) (fond 29) are mostly of more recent acquisition.[100]

Rich bibliographical collections are held in the division together with the personal papers of the bibliographer Ivan Kalynovych (1885–1927) (fond 57) and the historian Myron Korduba (1876–1947) (fond 61). However, part of the Kalynovych papers are now held by the Lviv Oblast State Archive (LODA), and most of Korduba's impressive bibliographical files remain in the custody of the Institute of Social Sciences in Lviv.[101]

Other important materials are the papers of the noted feminist leader and writer Natalia Kobryns'ka (1855–1920) (fond 161), the progressive activist Oleksii Kapnist (1797–1869) (in fond 9), and the more abundant papers of such local Galician activists as the Hrushkevych family (fond 41) (1861–1962). Parts of some of these fonds came with institutional collections, but other parts were added later.

Finally, new fonds have been established for leaders who became important after 1939, such as the military leader Vitalii Chaikin (1895–1976) (fond 138), the political activist Mykola Hnydiuk (1918–76) (fond 35), the publicist Ivan Prokopiv (1901–73) (fond 86), the classical philologist Iurii Mushak (1904–73) (fond 69), and the educator Fedir Naumenko (b. 1901) (fond 148).[102]

To supplement its own holdings, the manuscript division of LNB AN has a large file of microfilms from other Soviet and foreign repositories. Its large number of microfilms from Poland include copies of many manuscripts now held by the Ossolineum in Wrocław that were originally housed in Lviv.[103]

100 These are all listed and briefly described in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*.

101 Regarding the Korduba collection, with emphasis on the bibliographic files, see the survey analysis by Ia. R. Dashkevych (pseudonym S. Piskovyi), "M. M. Korduba ta ioho 'Bibliohrafiia istorii Ukrainy,'" *Naukovo-informatsiinyi biuleten' Arkhivnoho upravlinnia URSR*, 1963, no. 2, pp. 62–64. See more details about the life and unpublished works of Korduba in the introduction to the reprint edition of his bibliography, *La littérature historique soviétique: Compte-rendu 1917–1931*, ed. Omeljan Pritsak et al. (Munich, 1972; "Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies," vol. 10).

102 These are all listed in *Osobysti arkhivni fondy*.

103 The division has a card file covering available microfilms. For reference to the catalogue of available microfilms from the Biblioteka Narodowa in Warsaw, including those from the Ossolineum in Wrocław, see the citation in fn. 49.

Apart from the manuscript division itself, other divisions in the Academy Library in Lviv retain materials of an archival nature. Special note should be made of the division of graphic art *(Viddil mystetstva),* with its varied collections of drawings, prints, and other illustrative materials. Its interesting groups of revolutionary and wartime posters have been described in published accounts.[104] This division also boasts a collection of over 35,000 photographs, many of which are unique. They have come to the library as part of earlier collections in the Lviv area, including the extensive one of the Library of the National Home.[105]

The library boasts an extremely rich collection of early maps, including some early manuscript maps, plans and atlases, as well as more numerous engravings. No catalogue is available of the cartographic holdings, unfortunately; only a brief survey description has been published, together with a more specialized survey of the sixteenth-century materials.[106]

This survey has given only the barest outline of the manuscript riches now held by the Stefanyk Scientific Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Lviv. Much more detailed analysis of many of the collections is needed, and many inventories, catalogues, and manuscript descriptions are required to inform prospective researchers about the library's tremendous manuscript wealth. Only such production can rectify the unfortunate situation today, whereby one of the major library collections in Eastern Europe remains one of the least known and least accessible to researchers in the

[104] The posters from the Second World War are listed in a published catalogue compiled by N. P. Ivanova and Ia. V. Ianchak, *Plakaty perioda Velikoi otechestvennoi voiny Sovetskogo soiuza 1941–1945 gg.: Katalog,* ed. by Kh. I. Sanotskaia (Lviv, 1976). See also the surveys of I. P. Ivanova, "Dokumenty revoliutsii: Kolektsiia radians'kykh plakativ 1918–1921 rr. u viddili mystetstva," in *Biblioteka ta informatsiia,* pp. 120–26; and "Kollektsiia plakatov perioda Velikoi otechestvennoi voiny 1941–1945 gg.," in *Biblioteka i naukovo-tekhnichnyi prohres,* pp. 81–90.

[105] See the brief survey by Ia. V. Ianchak, "Zbirka fotohrafii viddilu mystetstva," in *Skarbnytsia znan',* pp. 87–91.

[106] The survey by V. M. Kabusan and S. A. Lukonin, "Materialy z istorychnoi heohrafii Zakhidnoi Ukrainy v kartohrafichnii zbirtsi," in *Skarbnytsia znan',* pp. 83–86, gives a bare outline of the extent and variety of the cartographic holdings. The sixteenth-century materials are surveyed by M. H. Vavryshyn, "Materialy do istorii kartohrafii Ukrainy XVI st. u fondakh LNB AN URSR," in *Biblioteka i naukovo-tekhnichnyi prohres,* pp. 101–109.

Slavic and Eastern European fields. The present outline serves only as an interim account, which, one hopes, will stimulate the production of more detailed finding aids.

Harvard University

BIBLIOGRAPHIC STUDIES

Two Contributions to the Bibliography of Meletij Smotryc'kyj

ROBERT MATHIESEN

Meletij Smotryc'kyj (ca. 1578–1633) was without question one of the most highly educated and talented Ukrainian writers and scholars of the early seventeenth century. Although he devoted the greater part of his labor to the extremely sensitive religious and political issues of his time, and published a number of influential tractates on them (for the most part in Polish), he is now remembered as a consummate verbal artist, as a theorist of verse, and, especially, as the author of a notable grammar of the Church Slavonic language, *Hrammatyky Slavénskyja právylnoe Sýntagma* (A Compendium of the Rules of Slavonic Grammar), first published by the Orthodox Brotherhood of Vilnius on their presses at Vevis in 1618–1619. It is this grammar which is the subject of the present study.

In retrospect, Smotryc'kyj's grammar was by far the most comprehensive and sophisticated of all the early printed grammars of Church Slavonic, and stood on the level of the contemporary European grammars of Greek and Latin.[1] It was greatly esteemed not only by its author's contemporaries, but also by many later generations of scholars, for it quickly supplanted even the best of the previously published grammars of Church Slavonic, Lavrentij Zizanij's *Hrammatyka slovenska* (Slavonic Grammar) of 1596, and was republished four times and epitomized twice during the century and a half following its original publication.[2] As late as

[1] References appear in full on pp. 241–44. See O. Horbač's monograph and edition (Horbatsch 1964, 1974), where the earlier analyses are reviewed.

[2] Zizanij's grammar, unlike Smotryc'kyj's, was neither republished nor epitomized; yet even now copies of it seem to be more common than copies of the first edition of Smotryc'kyj's grammar. Not until the very end of the eighteenth century did there again appear grammars of Church Slavonic which were more than mere republications or epitomes of the grammar of Smotryc'kyj (cf. Mathiesen 1972, pp. 175–205).

the early nineteenth century the eminent slavist J. Dobrovský could write of Smotryc'kyj as a grammarian that "ejus praecepta ab omnibus semper aestimata fuere [his precepts have always been valued by all]," and it was only Dobrovský's own grammar of Church Slavonic, published in 1822, which finally supplanted Smotryc'kyj's grammar.[3]

A further measure of the esteem in which Smotryc'kyj's grammar was long held is the great rarity of its first edition, the only edition published during the author's lifetime (and presumably under his supervision) and thus the only one that can bear independent witness to its author's text and thought. It seems that most copies of the first edition were, so to speak, read and studied to pieces. The rarity as well as the importance of the relatively few copies of the first edition that have survived warrants publishing a census of them.[4]

The present study attempts (1) to take a preliminary census—based entirely on secondary sources—of the known copies of the first edition of Smotryc'kyj's grammar, and (2) to establish an accurate list of its published editions by laying to rest two bibliographical "ghosts" which too long have haunted works on Smotryc'kyj and his grammar.

I

During the nineteenth century V. M. Undol'skij and I. P. Karataev specified where a number of copies of the first edition of Smotryc'kyj's grammar were located.[5] A careful examination of their somewhat vague remarks reveals that they knew of the existence of at least sixteen copies of that edition. More recently H. Ja. Haljančėnka cited four additional copies which had been noticed by twentieth-century bibliographers.[6] However, I have been able to ascertain, entirely from secondary sources,

[3] Dobrovský 1822, p. LVIII.

[4] Of all the seventeenth-century editions and epitomes, only that of 1647/48 is now very common. No more than eight or nine copies of the epitome of 1638 have been recorded: in addition to the seven cited by Dietze 1974, p. 364, and Horbatsch 1977, pp. I, XIII–XIV, there are the private copy examined by Alter 1799, pp. 115–16 (no. III), and perhaps the copy in the collection of the Solovki Monastery cited by Undol'skij 1871, coll. 55–56 (no. 444). Cf. also Karataev 1883, pp. 466–67 (no. 474), Svěncyckyj 1908, p. 152 (no. 562), and Maksymenko 1975, p. 92 (no. 627). Perhaps as few as two or three copies of the edition of 1697 have survived: Kurdinovskij 1907, pp. 391–94, Bianu, Hodoş & Simonescu 1903–1944, I, pp. 351–54 (no. 109).

[5] Undol'skij 1848, p. 102 (no. 102), Karataev 1861, p. 31 (no. 206), Undol'skij 1871, coll. 32–33 (nos. 222, 225, 226), Karataev 1883, pp. 348–50 (no. 247 and two unnumbered entries) cite five copies from no. 8–13, 16, two copies from nos. 17–21, and copies no. 23–27, 33–35 of the present census.

[6] Golenčenko 1961, p. 61 (no. 194) adds copies no. 6, 14, 15, 22 of the present census.

that at least twenty-nine and perhaps as many as thirty-five copies of the first edition of Smotryc'kyj's grammar have survived to the present day. The following census lists these copies according to the cities in which they are held (or, in four cases, the cities in which they are most probably held); the one copy which cannot be traced after the death of its owner (D. V. Piskarev) and the sale of his collection in 1868 is given at the end of the census, as is the copy formerly in the Library of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, but—contrary to expectations—not now in the Saltykov-Ščedrin State Public Library at Leningrad.

BERLIN (?)

1. Deutsche Staatsbibliothek.
   Baumann 1956/57, pp. 65, 66.[7]

CAMBRIDGE

2. Cambridge University Library.
   Tyrrell & Simmons 1959/63, p. 391 (no. 14).

CRACOW

3. Biblioteka Jagiellońska.
   Horbatsch 1974, pp. I, XV.

GOR'KIJ

4. Oblastnaja biblioteka im. V. I. Lenina (C 22021).
   Privalova 1956, p. 498

JENA

5. Universitätsbibliothek Jena (8. Gl. XI, 18).
   Baumann 1956/57, 1958.

KIEV

6. Central'na naukova biblioteka Akademiji nauk Ukrajins'koji RSR (Kyr. 729).
   Petrov, Birjuk & Zolotar' 1958, pp. 37–38 (no. 70); Šolom 1958, p. 45.

LENINGRAD

7. Biblioteka Akademii nauk SSSR.
   Baumann 1956/57, 1958; Gurevič & Kopanev 1965, p. 287.[8]
8. Gos. publičnaja biblioteka im. M. E. Saltykova-Ščedrina (hereafter GPB) (I.8.26).

[7] This copy, interned after World War II, may have been returned to the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek since Baumann's inquiry.

[8] Although Baumann 1956/57, 1958 refers to a single copy, the statement of Gurevič & Kopanev 1965 might imply that this library holds more than one copy of the first edition.

Karataev 1861, p. 31 (no. 206); Luk'janenko 1973–75, II, pp. 75–79 (no. 63).[9]

9. GPB (I.8.27[a]).
   Stroev 1829, pp. 155–156 (no. 65); Luk'janenko 1973–75, II, pp. 75–79 (no. 63).[10]
10. GPB (I.8.27[b]).
    Luk'janenko 1973–75, II, pp. 75–79 (no. 63).[11]
11. GPB (I.8.27[v]).
    Luk'janenko 1973–75, II, pp. 75–79 (no. 63).[11]
12. GPB (I.8.27[g]).
    Luk'janenko 1973–75, II, pp. 75–79 (no. 63).[12]
13. GPB (XVII.14.7).
    Luk'janenko 1973–75, II, pp. 75–79 (no. 63).[11]

LVIV (?)

14. Deržavnyj muzej ukrajins'koho mystectva (hereafter DMUM).
    Svěncyckyj 1908, p. 152 (no. 561/426).[13]
15. DMUM.
    Svěncyckyj 1908, p. 152 (no. 561/427).[13]

MOSCOW

16. Gos. biblioteka SSSR im V. I. Lenina (hereafter GBL) (no. 3128).
    Undol'skij 1871, col. 32 (no. 222); Karataev 1883, p. 348; Šolom 1958, p. 45.[14]
17. GBL (no. 3130).
    Šolom 1958, p. 45.[15]
18. GBL (no. 5187).
    Šolom 1958, p. 45.[15]
19. GBL (no. 6266).
    Šolom 1958, p. 45.[15]

9 This copy was formerly in the private collection of I. P. Karataev.

10 This copy, as may be inferred from the description of it by Luk'janenko 1973–75, was formerly in the private collection of F. A. Tolstoj.

11 Two of these three copies, in all likelihood, were formerly in the private collections of A. N. Kasterin (Undol'skij 1848, p. 102 [no. 102]) and I. T. Jakovlev (Undol'skij 1871, coll. 32–33 [no. 225]).

12 This copy was formerly in the private collection of M. P. Pogodin (Undol'skij 1871, coll. 32–33 [no. 225]).

13 These two copies are not recorded by Maksymenko 1975, but this bibliographer's records of the holdings of this museum are quite problematic. Neither does he list, for example, the primer printed by Spirydon Sobal' at Kuceina in 1631 (cf. Svěncyckyj 1908, pp. 153–154 [no. 569]), although as recently as two years earlier its presence in the museum had been confirmed by Botvinnik 1973, p. 149.

14 This copy was formerly in the private collection of V. M. Undol'skij.

15 Two of these five copies, in all likelihood, were formerly in the private collection of N. P. Rumjancev and in the Library of the Moscow Theological Academy (Undol'skij 1871, coll. 32–33 [no. 225]).

20. GBL (no. 6267).
    Šolom 1958, p. 45.[15]
21. GBL (no. 6311).
    Šolom 1958, p. 45.[15]
22. Gos. publičnaja istoričeskaja biblioteka.
    Radčenko 1957, p. 598 (no. 197); Černyševa 1972, p. 28 (no. 472).
23. Gos. istoričeskij muzej (hereafter GIM) (Sobranie P. V. Ščapova).
    Ščepkina & Protas'eva 1958, p. 76.
24. GIM (Sobranie A. I. Xludova).
    Popov 1872 [second pagination], p. 7 (no. 67).[16]
25. GIM (Sobranie I. N. Carskogo).
    Stroev 1836, pp. 73–74 (no. 58); Ščepkina & Protas'eva 1958, p. 79.
26. GIM (Sobranie A. D. Čertkova).
    Ščepkina & Protas'eva 1958, p. 83.
27. Central'nyj gos. arxiv drevnix aktov, fond 125: Staropečatnye knigi Biblioteki Moskovskoj sinodal'noj tipografii.
    Bogojavlenskij & Jakovlev 1946–47, II, p. 143.[16a]
28. Private collection of A. I. Markuševič.
    Malyšev 1965, p. 387.

OXFORD

29. Bodleian Library (8° R18 Art. BS).
    Barnicot & Simmons 1951, p. 114.

PETROZAVODSK (?)

30. Gos. arxiv Karel'skoj ASSR.[17]

PRAGUE

31. Narodní knihovna (UK.8.I.23).
    Horbatsch 1974, pp. I, XV.

VIENNA

32. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek.
    Alter 1799, pp. 116–119 (no. IV); Horbatsch 1974, pp. I, XV.

VILNIUS

33. Lietuvos TSR Mokslų akademijos Centrinė biblioteka.
    Milovidov 1908b, pp. 34–35 (no. 26); Ivaškevičius 1959, p. 17, plate 15.

[16] This copy was acquired by Xludov from the private collection of A. I. Ozerskij (Undol'skij 1871, coll. 32–33 [no. 225]). It is not specifically cited in the brief notice of Xludov's collection given by Ščepkina & Protas'eva 1958, p. 77.

[16a] Note the remark in *Katalog* 1908, p. 11 (no. 29), that this copy is the one from which the edition of 1647/48 was printed, and that it still bears the corrections made for that revised edition.

[17] In all likelihood this is the present location of the copy formerly in the Library of the Vygoleksa Monastery (Barsov 1872/75, p. 78 [no. 1]), since the bulk of that library is now held there (Malyšev 1947, p. 149).

LOCATION UNKNOWN

34. Formerly owned by D. V. Piskarev.
    Undol'skij 1871, col. 33 (no. 226); Karataev 1883, p. 350.[18]
35. Formerly held by the Biblioteka S.-Petersburgskoj duxovnoj akademii.
    Rodosskij 1891–94, I, p. 107 (no. 64).

The above census, drawn entirely from secondary sources, doubtless is neither entirely complete nor entirely accurate. The author requests that additions and corrections be sent to him (Department of Slavic Languages, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island 02912, USA).[18a]

II

As already stated, Smotryc'kyj's grammar was published in five editions and two epitomes during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as follows:

1. First edition:
   Vevis, 1618–1619; octavo, [4+248]ff.[19]

[18] This copy seems not to have been among the small number of early Cyrillic imprints which the Moskovskij publičnyj i Rumjancevskij muzei acquired at the sale of Piskarev's collection (Viktorov 1871, pp. 22–23).

[18a] After this article had been submitted, my colleague Edward Kasinec called my attention to the existence of yet another copy, formerly in the private library of Professor A. E. Senn, who donated his books to the University of Wisconsin at Madison in 1974.

[19] This edition seems to have circulated in three original states, as follows:
(a) 248ff. = ______1618 Title + Text,
    copies no. 16, 35 at least;
(b) 252 ff. = 1619 Title + Preface + 1618 Title + Text,
    copies no. 5, 9, 19, 33 at least;
(c) 251 ff. = 1619 Title + Preface ______+ Text,
    copies no. 3, 6, 10, 13, 22, 32 at least.

These different states of the edition (as well as a variety of defective copies), the double title page with two different dates, and the obscurity of the place of printing (Vevis, mentioned only on the 1619 title page) in comparison with the city in which the publisher was situated (Vilnius, mentioned prominently on each title page) confused earlier bibliographers to the extent that they were sometimes at a loss about how many editions were represented by the copies at their disposal. Thus, Undol'skij 1871, coll. 32–33, registered three editions: Vevis, 1618 (no. 222); Vevis, 1619 (no. 225); Vilnius, 1619 (no. 226). The first two of these were also registered by Milovidov, 1908a, p. 12 (nos. 164, 165). The truth, however, was already latent in Milovidov's note in his other bibliography of the same year (1908b, pp. 34–35 [no. 26]), and was made patent to all by Baumann 1958. (Cf. also Šolom 1958, p. 45, and Anuškin 1972, pp. 80–85; the latter gives a photograph of each title page for comparison.)

2. First epitome (anonymous):
   Krem"janec', 1638; octavo, [104]ff.[20]
3. Second edition, revised from the first:
   Moscow, 7156 [=1647/48]; quarto, "388" [recte 378]ff.[21]
4. Third edition, reprinted from the first:
   Snagov, 1697; octavo, 4+246ff.[22]
5. Fourth edition, revised from the first and second:
   Moscow, 7229=1721; octavo, [3]+5+283+[1]ff.[23]
6. Second epitome (Feodor Maksimov):
   St. Petersburg, 1723; octavo, [4]+8+212+[24] pp.[24]
7. Fifth edition, reprinted from the fourth:
   Rîmnic, 1755; small octavo, 8+288ff.[25]

In addition to these seven well-attested publications, bibliographers and scholars occasionally cite two others, that is, the putative editions at Vilnius in 1629 and at Moscow in 1651 (both in quarto).[26] However, all nineteenth- and twentieth-century references to these editions are at second hand, and have been taken from sources of the eighteenth century.

The putative edition of 1651 was the first to make its appearance, being cited by J. L. Frisch in his *Historiam Linguae Sclavonicae continuat*

[20] Cf. fn. 4 above.

[21] Karataev 1883, p. 531 (no. 637); Zernova 1958, p. 67 (no. 206). In the United States, copies are held by the Library of Congress (as Basil Nadraga of that institution has kindly informed me), the Columbia University Library, and the Newberry Library at Chicago. Concerning this last copy see fn. 32 below.

[22] Cf. fn. 4 above.

[23] Bykova & Gurevič 1958, pp. 221–23 (no. 135); Zernova & Kameneva 1968, p. 56 (no. 142). In the United States a copy is held by the Newberry Library (Collins 1894, p. 653 [no. 12,510]), and a microfilm of that copy by the University of California Library at Berkeley. In the National Union Catalogue of Pre-1956 Imprints this microfilm is wrongly identified as having been made from the edition of 1647/48.

[24] Bykova & Gurevič 1958, pp. 261–264 (no. 194); Zernova & Kameneva 1968, p. 475 (no. 1356); Bykova 1971, pp. 52–53 (no. 40). In the United States a copy is held by the Columbia University Library.

[25] Bianu, Hodoş & Simonescu 1903–44, II, p. 132 (no. 295); Mihailović 1964, p. 44 (no. 31). In the United States copies are held by the Columbia University Library and the Harvard University Library.

[26] Most recently, Maxnovec' 1960, p. 549, and Prokošina 1966, p. 106. Note that the preface and the appendix in the edition of 1647/48 (both added by the editors of that edition) were separately reprinted at Moscow in 1782 under the titles *Predislovie ko grammatikě slavenskoj* and *Besědovanie Maksima Greka o pol'zě grammatiki*: see Kacpržak et al. 1962–67, I, pp. 96–97 (no. 534), II, p. 468 (no. 5626). These reprints are the source of the somewhat garbled entries in Maxnovec' 1960, ibid., for an edition of 1782 and a reprint of the preface in 1788.

Quatuor capitibus . . . (Berlin, 1727).[27] All subsequent references to this edition, including those made by V. K. Trediakovskij in his *Razgovor . . . ob ortografii starinnoj i novoj* (St. Petersburg, 1748) and by D. Semenov-Rudnev in his manuscript *Biblioteka rossijskaja, ili svěděnie o vsěx knigax v Rossii s načala tipografii na svět vyšedšix* (ca. 1785), derive at least the date from Frisch's citation.[28] During the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century a small controversy arose over the existence of this edition, or—more precisely—whether references to it were not in fact mistaken references to the edition of 1647/48.[29] As a result of this controversy the putative edition of 1651 was excluded from the most competent bibliographies of the nineteenth century.[30] Nevertheless, it was decisively settled only in the last decade of that century, when P. Nikolaevskij's examination of the well-preserved records of the Moscow Printing Yard (Pečatnyj dvor) during the patriarchate of Iosif (1642–1652) showed that although there had been eighteen publications which Karataev had overlooked (in his final bibliography of 1883), no grammar other than the edition of 1647/48 had been published at Moscow during those eleven years. The fullness of the records examined by Nikolaevskij makes it certain that the putative edition of Smotryc'kyj's grammar in quarto at Moscow in 1651 never existed.[31]

From what source, then, did Frisch derive his information? Still extant is a copy of a Church Slavonic grammar in quarto, formerly in the Library of Louis-Lucien Bonaparte and now held by the Newberry Library at Chicago, which has no internal indication of the place and date of its publication, but which on the spine of its seventeenth-century binding bears the half-obliterated inscription in ink "Grammatica Moscovitica" (Muscovite Grammar), and which has stamped over that inscription (in letters of the seventeenth century or archaicizing letters of the eighteenth century) the later inscription "Grammatica Sclavonica Moscoviae. 1651" (Slavonic Grammar. At Moscow, 1651). A comparison of selected pages, however, shows that this volume is actually a copy of the 1647/48 edition of Smotryc'kyj's grammar, which lacks the last two folia

27 I have not seen this publication, but know of the citation in it from the later literature cited below and from Eichler 1967, p. 35.
28 Cf. Trediakovskij 1849, III, p. 63, and Semenov-Rudnev 1881, p. 64.
29 Cf. Alter 1799, p. 122 (no. VII); Dobrovský 1822, pp. LIX–LXI, 706–720.
30 Karataev 1861, pp. 81–83; Undol'skij 1871, coll. 76–77, 333; Karataev 1883, pp. 541–47. Note that in his revision of Semenov-Rudnev's bibliography Undol'skij (1891, second pagination, p. 30 [no. 108]) silently corrected the date 1651 to 1648.
31 Nikolaevskij 1890–91, III, pp. 147–48.

(containing the long colophon). This copy, which clearly came to Western Europe very early, may have been the very copy from which Frisch derived his mistaken reference.[32]

The existence of this copy, however, only pushes the problem of the mistaken date one step further into the past. How did its early West European owner come to suppose that it had been printed in 1651? If he did not simply guess, or simply blunder in converting the printer's date A.M. 7156 into the Christian era, he may have been confused by the elaborate syntax of the colophon on the last two folia (which may still have been present when he owned the book). This colophon, rightly interpreted, states that the printing of the book began on 6 December A.M. 7156 (i.e., on 6 December A.D. 1647) and ended on February 2 "of the same year" (*togóže lěta*), "in the third year" (*v trétie lěto*) of the reign of Aleksej Mixajlovič and in the sixth year of the patriarchate of Iosif (i.e., on 2 February A.D. 1648). A Western European, more familiar with Latin syntax than with Slavonic, might have interpreted the phrase "of the same year" in an ablative sense as "from the same year" and taken it together with the following phrase "in the third year," thereby mistakenly supposing that the colophon stated that the printing of the book began in A.M. 7156 and ended three years later, in A.M. 7159 or A.D. 1651.[33]

The putative edition of 1629 seems first to have appeared about sixty years later, in D. Semenov-Rudnev's inchoate bibliography (ca. 1785): *Monaxa Meletija Smotrickago Slavenskaja Grammatika, vtorago izdanija, v Vil'ně 1629 goda, v 4; v akad. bibl.* (Monk Meletij Smotrickij's Slavonic Grammar, the second edition, at Vilnius in 1629, in quarto; in the Academy Library).[34] (From other references it is clear that the "Academy Library" is the Library of the Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg.) All subsequent references, including those by Karataev, Undol'skij, and Milovidov, derive wholly from Semenov-Rudnev's citation; no later bibliographer or scholar has ever succeeded in finding a copy of such an edition, and it is not now in the Library of the Academy of Sciences.[35]

32 Cf. Collins 1894, p. 653 (no. 12,511). I am very much obliged to Arthur A. Prieditis of the Newberry Library, who sent me photocopies of the first and last pages of the volume and of the inscriptions on its spine.

33 So perhaps even Dobrovský (1822, p. LIX), who speaks of the Moscow edition in quarto as "coeptae 1648, finitae 1651 [begun in 1648, ended in 1651]."

34 Semenov-Rudnev 1881, p. 43.

35 Karataev 1861, p. 42 (no. 291); Undol'skij 1871, col. 43 (no. 319); Karataev 1883, p. 413 (no. 348); Milovidov 1908a, p. 8 (no. 76); Golenčenko 1961, p. 49 (no. 146). Cf. Jagić 1910, p. 28; Gurevič & Kopanev 1965, p. 287.

The entry arouses doubt in and of itself, apart from the fact that no later bibliographer has ever been able to verify Semenov-Rudnev's entry. It states that the edition was in quarto, but the attested first edition was in octavo and the supposition that any of them might have printed a grammar in quarto at Vilnius (or Vevis) in 1629 contradicts the known practices of the publishers in question.[36] Moreover, the title cited is not the one which Smotryc'kyj gave to his grammar, and the author's name is given in its later form (Smotrickij instead of Smotriskij; it is spelled with *s*, not *c*, on the title pages of the first edition). All this shows that Semenov-Rudnev's entry is not a straightforward de visu description of one copy, but is to some extent based either on secondhand information or on inference. (Such entries are not at all rare in his bibliography; other examples would be his entry for the putative edition of 1651, discussed above, and even his entry for the first edition of Smotryc'kyj's grammar, where the author's name and the title of the work are altered in the same way: *Meletija Smotrickago Grammatika Slavenskaja, v Vil'ně 1619, v 8 d. i v. Moskvě 1721 v akad. bibl. i patriaršej* [Meletij Smotrickij's Slavonic Grammar, at Vilnius in 1619, in octavo, and at Moscow in 1721; in the Academy Library and in the Patriarchal Library].[37]) The fact that both entries are distorted in the same way and that both cite the "Academy Library" as the first location may indicate that both entries were drawn from one of the earlier published surveys of the holdings of the Library of the Academy of Sciences. Unfortunately, none of these earlier surveys is available to me at present, so the conjecture must remain unverified for now.[38] Of course, even if the conjecture is true, the original cause of the error will still remain to be found. If it did not arise from a simple misreading of the title page with the date 1619 in the first edition, or from a simple slip of the pen, it may have arisen from confusion with a certain

36 In 1586 the Mamoniči at Vilnius issued a quarto edition, with no title page and with a colophon at the end, of a brief medieval tract on Church Slavonic grammar; this archaic format, still employed at Moscow in the middle of the seventeenth century and even later, had been given up in favor of a more modern format (in octavo or smaller, with title page and no final colophon) at Vilnius by the end of the sixteenth century, e.g., in Zizanij's grammar of 1596. On the publication of 1586 see Karataev 1883, pp. 232–33 (no. 113); Zernova 1959, pp. 184–87; Golenčenko 1961, p. 13 (no. 18); Luk'janenko 1973–75, I, pp. 67–69 (no. 15). In addition to the two defective copies cited by these bibliographers, there was formerly a more complete copy in the Library of the Byzantine-Rite Catholic (Uniate) Chapter at Peremyšl'; this copy may now be with the bulk of that library in the Biblioteka Narodowa at Warsaw. All three copies are cited by Xarlampovič 1900, pp. 211–12.

37 Semenov-Rudnev 1881, p. 33.

38 These earlier publications have been listed by Bel'čikov, Begunov & Roždestvenskij 1963, pp. 71–72 (nos. 557–59).

primer printed at Vilnius in 1621 under the somewhat misleading title *Hrammatika* (Grammar).[39] (The existence of two title pages, dated 1618 and 1619, respectively, in the first edition of Smotryc'kyj's grammar, and the improbability of a second edition's having been published only one year after the publication of the first edition, would only increase the opportunities for confusion.) In any case, the claim that the putative second edition of 1629 was in quarto surely owes something to the fact that the true second edition of 1647/48 was actually in quarto.[40]

Whatever the cause, we may conclude with Dobrovský (1822, p. LX) that the putative edition of 1629 "vix exstet [hardly exists]" for yet another reason: if it had existed, we would have to believe that three dozen copies of an edition in octavo survived whereas all copies of a second edition printed in quarto only ten years later were destroyed. Until such time as the sources of information on which Semenov-Rudnev drew and the causes of the many errors which he made are better known, this last consideration may suffice to lay to rest the "ghost" of an edition of Smotryc'kyj's grammar printed at Vilnius in 1629.[41]

* * *

Not only the bibliographer but also the historian of linguistics and the historical linguist should be concerned with such matters as have been discussed here. Old grammars, dictionaries, primers, and the like are in themselves data for the historian of linguistic thought, and are sources of data for the historian of the language which they treat or in which they are written. Such textbooks are particularly important when they treat standard or literary languages, for languages of this sort are in large part created and shaped by textbooks.

All too often, however, the bibliographically naive linguist is content to use any edition of such a textbook which comes to hand, and even a linguist who is somewhat more sophisticated in bibliographical matters may be content to use any copy of the most appropriate edition. Yet under

39 Stroev 1829, p. 162 (no. 68); Karataev 1883, pp. 365–66 (no. 269); Luk'janenko 1973–75, II, pp. 83–86 (no. 66). This primer is in octavo. Note also the editions—or variants of the same edition—of the same primer in 1618, described by Barnicot & Simmons 1951, p. 111 (nos. 13–14).

40 To forestall an argument that the format in quarto of the real second edition (1647/48) might reflect the format in quarto of an edition no longer extant, it must be emphasized that the edition of 1647/48 was printed from a copy of the edition of 1618–1619 in octavo which is still extant, that is, from copy no. 27 in the above census.

41 A similar argument might have been made for the non-existence of the putative edition of 1651, had it been necessary to do so in that case.

the conditions of early printing, single copies of the same edition could have textual variants just as significant as those exhibited by different editions, and the linguist who is blind to this possibility is in real danger of wasting his labor. R. C. Alston (1966) has adduced telling examples of just such situations from recent work on early printed textbooks of English. Indeed, when the work is sufficiently important (as Smotryc'kyj's grammar is for specialists in Late Church Slavonic or in the history of many modern Slavic standard languages), the linguist should be ready to devote as much bibliographical effort towards establishing its authorial text as literary scholars have long been accustomed to spend on the more eminent writers—an example is the vast amount of highly sophisticated bibliographical study devoted to the plays of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. The present study, obviously, is only a small step, and not the first, in this direction (cf. Horbatsch 1964), but even modest beginnings are better than no beginnings at all.[42]

Brown University

REFERENCES

Alston, R. C. 1966. "Bibliography and Historical Linguistics." *The Library*, series 5, XXI, pp. 181–91.

Alter, F. C. 1799. *Philologisch-kritische Miscellaneen.* Vienna.

Anuškin, A. 1972. *Tajny staropečatnoj knigi.* Symferopil'.

Barnicot, J.D.A., and J.S.G. Simmons. 1951. "Some Unrecorded Early-printed Slavonic Books in English Libraries." *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, II, pp. 98–118.

Barsov, E. 1872/75. *Opisanie rukopisej i knig, xranjaščixsja v Vygoleksinskoj bibliotekě.* Lětopis' zanjatij Arxeografičeskoj kommissii, VI. St. Petersburg.

Baumann, H. 1956/57. "Slavica in der Universitätsbibliothek Jena: Die 'Slavische Grammatik' des Meletij Smotrickij vom Jahre 1619." *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena, Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, VI, pp. 63–67.

______. 1958. "Das Erscheinungsjahr der 'Slavischen Grammatik' Meletij Smotrickijs." *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, III, pp. 682–85.

Bel'čikov, N. F., Ju. K. Begunov, and N. P. Roždestvenskij. 1963. *Spravočnik-ukazatel' pečatnyx opisanij slavjano-russkix rukopisej.* Moscow and Leningrad.

[42] I am grateful for the assistance of Messrs. Nadraga and Prieditis, as acknowledged above, and of Edward Kasinec and my former student Robert F. Allen, all of whom have supplied me with facts I otherwise would not have obtained. The recent facsimile edition edited by V. V. Nimčuk (Meletij Smotryc'kyj, *Hramatyka* [Kiev, 1979]), which is based on one of the copies no. 17–21, supplemented from copy no. 6, will materially assist future researchers.

Bianu, I., N. Hodoş, and D. Simonescu. 1903–1944. *Bibliografia românescă veche 1508–1830*, I–IV. Bucharest.

Bogojavlenskij, S. K., and A. I. Jakovlev. 1946–47. *Central'nyj gosudarstvennyj arxiv drevnix aktov: Putevoditel'*, I–II. Moscow.

Botvinnik, M. 1973. *Lavrentij Zizanij*. Minsk.

Bykova, T. A. 1971. *Katalog russkoj knigi kirillovskoj pečati Peterburgskix tipografij XVIII veka*. (Gos. Publičnaja biblioteka im. M. E. Saltykova-Ščedrina.) Leningrad.

Bykova, T. A., and M. M. Gurevič. 1958. *Opisanie izdanij napečatannyx kirillicej 1689—janvar' 1725 g.* Moscow and Leningrad.

Collins, V. 1894. *Attempt at a Catalogue of the Library of the late Prince Louis-Lucien Bonaparte*. London.

Černyševa, N. F. 1972. *Katalog russkix knig kirillovskoj pečati XVI–XVIII vv.* (Gos. publičnaja istoričeskaja biblioteka.) Moscow.

Dietze, J. 1974. "Eine gekürzte und bearbeitete Fassung der Grammatik von Smotrickij aus dem Jahre 1638." *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, XIX, pp. 364–76.

Dobrovský, J. 1822. *Institutiones Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris*. Vienna.

Eichler, E. 1967. *Die slawistischen Studien des Johann Leonhard Frisch*. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Slawistik, XL. Berlin

Golenčenko, G. Ja. 1961. *Bibliografičeskij spisok belorusskix staropečatnyx izdanij XVI–XVIII vv.* (Gos. biblioteka BSSR im. V. I. Lenina.) Minsk.

Gurevič, M. M., and A. I. Kopanev. 1965. "Sobranie staropečatnyx knig Biblioteki Akademii nauk SSSR." *Sbornik statej i materialov Biblioteki Akademii nauk SSSR po knigovedeniju*, [I], pp. 275–91.

Horbatsch, O. 1964. *Die vier Ausgaben der kirchenslavischen Grammatik von M. Smotryc'kyj*. Osteuropastudien der Hochschulen des Landes Hessen, Reihe III: Frankfurter Abhandlungen zur Slavistik, VII. Wiesbaden.

———. 1974. *Meletij Smotryćkyj, Hrammatiki slavenskija pravilnoe syntagma, Jevje 1619*. Specimina Philologiae Slavicae, IV. Frankfurt-am-Main.

———. 1977. *Hrammatiki ili pismennica jazyka sloven'skaho, Kremjaneć 1638*. Specimina Philologiae Slavicae, XI. Frankfurt-am-Main.

Ivaškevičius, A. 1959. *Lietuvos TSR Mokslų akademijos Centrinė biblioteka*. Vilnius.

Jagić, I. V. 1910. *Istorija slavjanskoj filologii*. Ènciklopedija slavjanskoj filologii, I. St. Petersburg.

Kacpržak, E. I., et al. 1962–67. *Svodnyj katalog russkoj knigi graždanskoj pečati XVIII veka, 1725–1800*, I–V. Moscow.

Karataev, I. 1861. *Xronologičeskaja rospis' slavjanskix knig, napečatannyx kirillovskimi bukvami, 1491–1730*. St. Petersburg.

———. 1883. *Opisanie slavjano-russkix knig napečatannyx kirillovskimi bukvami*, I: *s 1491 po 1652*. Sbornik Otdělenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti Imp. Akademii nauk, XXXIV:2. St. Petersburg.

[*Katalog.*] 1908. *Katalog jubilejnoj vystavki v pamjat' 200-lětija graždanskoj azbuki 1708–1908 g.* Moscow.

Kurdinovskij, V. 1907. "Rukopisnaja cerkovnoslavjanskaja grammatika Gerboveckago monastyrja Bessarabskoj gubernii." *Russkij filologičeskij věstnik*, LVII, pp. 389–97; LVIII, pp. 307–330.

Luk'janenko, V. I. 1973–75. *Katalog belorusskix izdanij kirillovskogo šrifta XVI–XVII vv.*, I–II. (Gos. publičnaja biblioteka im. M. E. Saltykova-Ščedrina.) Leningrad.

Maksymenko, F. P. 1975. *Kyrylyčni starodruky ukrajins'kyx drukaren', ščo zberihajut'sja u L'vivs'kyx zbirkax (1574–1800).* Lviv.

Malyšev, V. I. 1947. "Zametki o rukopisnyx sobranijax Petrozavodska i Tobol'ska." *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* (hereafter *TODL*), V, pp. 149–58.

———. 1965. "Moskviči—sobirateli pis'mennoj i pečatnoj stariny." *TODL*, XXI, pp. 383–89.

Mathiesen, R. C. 1972. "The Inflectional Morphology of the Synodal Church Slavonic Verb." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University. (Ann Arbor, Mich., University Microfilms, order no. 72–31,222.)

Maxnovec', L. Je. 1960. *Ukrajins'ki pys'mennyky: Bio-bibliohrafičnyj slovnyk*, I: *Davnja ukrajins'ka literatura (XI–XVIII st.st.).* Kiev.

Mihailović, G. 1964. *Srpska bibliografija XVIII veka.* Belgrade.

Milovidov, A. I. 1908a. *Staropečatnyja slavjano-russkija izdanija, vyšedšija iz zapadno-russkix tipografij XVI–XVIII vv.* Čtenija v Imp. Obščestvě istorii i drevnostej rossijskix pri Moskovskom universitetě (hereafter ČOIDR), CCIV (1908:1). Moscow.

———. 1908b. *Opisanie slavjano-russkix staropečatnyx izdanij Vilenskoj publičnoj biblioteki (1491–1800 gg.).* Vilnius.

Nikolaevskij, P. 1890–91. "Moskovskij pečatnyj dvor pri patriarxě Nikoně." *Xristianskoe čtenie*, 1890:1, pp. 114–41; 1890:5, pp. 434–67; 1891:1, pp. 147–86; 1891:4, pp. 151–86.

Petrov, S. O., Ja. D. Birjuk, and T. P. Zolotar'. 1958. *Slavjanskie knigi kirillovskoj pečati XV–XVIII vv.* (Gos. publičnaja biblioteka Ukrainskoj SSR.) Kiev.

Popov, A. 1872. *Opisanie rukopisej i katalog knig cerkovnoj pečati Biblioteki A. I. Xludova.* Moscow.

Privalova, N. I. 1956. "Drevnerusskie rukopisi i staropečatnye knigi Oblastnoj biblioteki, Oblastnogo kraevedčeskogo i Xudožestvennogo muzeev v g. Gor'kom." *TODL*, XII, pp. 494–505.

Prokošina, E. S. 1966. *Meletij Smotrickij.* Minsk.

Radčenko, E. S. 1957. "Slavjano-russkie staropečatnye knigi v Gosudarstvennoj publičnoj istoričeskoj biblioteke v Moskve." *TODL*, XIII, pp. 591–98.

Rodosskij, A. 1891–94. *Opisanie staropečatnyx i cerkovno-slavjanskix knig, xranjaščixsja v Bibliotekě S.-Peterburgskoj duxovnoj akademii*, I–II. St. Petersburg.

Semenov-Rudnev, D. 1881. *Biblioteka rossijskaja ili svěděnie o vsěx knigax v Rossii s načala tipografii na svět vyšedšix.* Pamjatniki drevnej pis'mennosti i iskusstva, XX. St. Petersburg.

Stroev, P. 1829. *Obstojatel'noe opisanie staropečatnyx knig slavjanskix i rossijskix, xranjaščixsja v Bibliotekě . . . Fedora Andreeviča Tolstogo.* Moscow.

———. 1836. *Opisanie staropečatnyx knig slavjanskix, naxodjaščixsja v Bibliotekě . . . Ivana Nikitiča Carskago.* Moscow.

Svěncyckyj, I. 1908. *Kataloh knyh cerkovno-slavjanskoy* [sic] *pečaty.* Žovkva.

Ščepkina, M. V., and T. N. Protas'eva. 1958. *Sokrovišča drevnej pis'mennosti i staroj pečati.* Gos. istoričeskij muzej, Trudy: Pamjatniki kul'tury, XXX. Moscow.

Šolom, F. Ja. 1958. "Zarodžennja i rozvytok naukovoji filolohičnoji dumky v Rosiji i na Ukrajini v XVI-peršij polovyni XVII st." *Filolohičnyj zbirnyk* (AN URSR, Ukrajins'kyj komitet slavistiv), pp. 40–72. Kiev.

Trediakovskij, V. K. 1849. *Sočinenija,* I–III. St. Petersburg.

Tyrrell, E. P., and J.S.G. Simmons. 1959/63. "Slavonic Books before 1700 in Cambridge Libraries." *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society,* III, pp. 382–400.

Undol'skij, V. M. 1848. *Katalog slavjanorusskix knig cerkovnoj pečati Biblioteki A. N. Kasterina.* ČOIDR, III (1848:9). Moscow.

______. 1871. *Očerk slavjano-russkoj bibliografii s dopolnenijami A. F. Byčkova i A. Viktorova.* Moscow.

______. 1891. *Biblioteka rossijskaja ili svěděnija o vsěx knigax v Rossii s načala tipografii na svět vyšedšix. Trud episkopa Damaskina (Semenova-Rudneva).* ČOIDR, CLVI (1891:1). Moscow.

Viktorov, A. 1871. "Sobranie D. V. Piskareva." *Otčet Moskovskago publičnago i Rumjancevskago muzeev za 1867–1869 gg.,* pp. 12–23.

Xarlampovič, K. 1900. "Novaja bibliografičeskaja naxodka." *Kievskaja starina,* LXX:7–8, pp. 211–24.

Zernova, A. S. 1958. *Knigi kirillovskoj pečati izdannye v Moskve v XVI–XVII vekax: Svodnyj katalog.* Moscow.

______. 1959. "Tipografija Mamoničej v Vil'ne (XVII vek)." *Kniga: Issledovanija i materialy,* I, pp. 167–223.

______ and T. N. Kameneva. 1968. *Svodnyj katalog russkoj knigi kirillovskoj pečati XVIII veka.* Moscow.

DOCUMENTS

A Contemporary's Account of the Causes of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising

FRANK E. SYSYN

In the spring of 1648, the commanders and most of the standing army of the Kingdom of Poland fell into the hands of Cossack rebels and their Tatar allies. By the summer of that year, the swelling rebel army routed the government's forces, and Warsaw lay virtually undefended as the Commonwealth grappled with the slow procedure of electing a new king. Violent social conflict and xenophobia gripped the Ukraine as peasants joined the Cossacks in wreaking bloody vengeance on all whom they perceived to be their oppressors—landlords, wealthy burghers, Catholic clergymen, and Jews. In some instances, religious grievances or discontent with the old order inspired nobles and burghers to side with the rebels. By autumn, the rebels' position was so strong that the promise of a peaceful settlement carried the day for John Casimir's candidacy to the vacant throne. Hetman Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi sought to win him over with proposals to alter the Commonwealth's constitution so the new king could rule as other monarchs did.[1] At Christmas, Khmel'nyts'kyi entered Kiev to the acclaim of Orthodox clerics and students of the Kiev Collegium, who hailed him as "well-named Bohdan, given by God" and "a liberator of the people from Polish servitude."[2]

After 1648, the revolt became an international conflict as Ottomans, Moldavians, Muscovites, Transylvanians, and Swedes were drawn into the duel between the rebels and the Commonwealth. Each new round of

[1] Khmel'nyts'kyi to John Casimir, 15 November 1648, *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho,* ed. I. Kryp"iakevych and I. Butych (Kiev, 1961), p. 80.

[2] "Dyaryusz podróży do Pereasławia i traktowania tamtejszego z Chmielnickim panów komissarzów polskich, przez Wojciecha Miaskowskiego podkomorzego lwowskiego spisany od 1 stycznia do 7 marca 1649," [Jakuba Michałowskiego wojskiego lubelskiego a pozniej kasztelana bieckiego] *Księga pamiętnicza* (Cracow, 1864) (= Zabytki z Dziejów, Oświaty i Sztuk Pięknych wydawane staraniem C. K. Towarzystwa Naukowego Krakowskiego, 2), p. 377.

war and negotiations changed the goals and the composition of the rebel camp. Continuity was provided by the wily Cossack hetman, who forged a new polity and a new order in the Ukrainian lands. But even Khmel'nyts'kyi's death in 1657 did not bring an end to what was by then a struggle throughout Eastern Europe. As late as the 1670s, it was uncertain what form the young Cossack Hetmanate would take and what power would benefit ultimately from the conflict initiated by Khmel'nyts'kyi's revolt.

By the 1670s even an assiduous observer would have been hard put to describe the original causes and subsequent evolution of the revolt. The very territorial base of the rebels had shifted, and new conditions had altered the political culture, social structure, and patterns of thought of the principals. But even at Christmas 1648 it must have been difficult to recall what the Ukrainian lands and their people had been like ten months earlier.

The momentous events of 1648 and subsequent years inspired contemporary descriptions almost immediately. Those written at a remove, both geographically and emotionally, were more likely to be attempts at balanced accounts, albeit on the basis of limited information.[3] Closer to the storm, descriptions tended to be undigested reports of events, propaganda tracts by the opposing sides, or eyewitness accounts by traumatized victims of the first, bloody stage of the revolt.[4] Almost all of these accounts addressed, to some degree, the problem of the causes of the revolt.

While researching the Khmel'nyts'kyi period in the manuscript collection of the Czartoryski Library in Cracow, I came upon a discussion of the revolt that, to my knowledge, has never been mentioned in the scholarly literature. Copied in a small hand on folios 323 and 324 of the seventeenth-century manuscript numbered 1657, the "Discourse on the Present Cossack or Peasant War" belongs to the discussions written in the midst of the revolt in an attempt to affect its outcome. In the seventeenth-

[3] For foreign histories of the Khmel'nyts'kyi revolt, see D. S. Nalyvaiko, "Zakhidnoevropeis'ki istoryko-literaturni dzherela pro vyzvol'nu viinu ukrains'koho narodu 1648–1654 rr.," *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal,* 1969, no. 8, pp. 137–44; no. 9, pp. 137–43; no. 10, pp. 134–45; no. 11, pp. 131–36; no. 12, pp. 128–32.

[4] The best discussion of sources on the Khmel'nyts'kyi revolt remains the bibliographic note, "Dzherela do istorii Khmel'nychchyny i istorychna tradytsiia ii," in Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy,* 10 vols. (reprinted New York, 1954–58), 8, pt. 2: 199–211. For a discussion of Jewish sources, see Bernard D. Weinryb, "The Hebrew Chronicles on Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and the Cossack-Polish War," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1, no. 2 (June 1977): 153–77.

century Commonwealth, political opinions were often expressed in published or unpublished statements entitled "Dyskurs," "Sententia," "Zdanie," etc. They served to influence public opinion and to conduct debates. Proponents of a particular policy sought support from the king, magnates, and middle and petty nobles by explaining contemporary issues and proposing how they might best be handled. The statements were frequently anonymous, which allowed greater freedom of expression, since individuals and factions did not have to commit themselves to a policy publicly or to reveal their intentions fully to their adversaries. Of course, contemporaries were often aware of who stood behind a particular work.

In contrast to the many such discourses of the seventeenth century that explained programs carefully and calmly, the "Discourse on the Present Cossack or Peasant War" is a highly emotional account of events and plan for action.[5] In many ways, it is similar in tone and intent to the partisan political poetry of the Khmel'nyts'kyi years, in particular the exhortatory clarions to arms.[6] Although the author is unknown, his sympathies are apparent: he espouses a fight to the end against the rebels and propagates a fanatically intolerant Catholic position toward the Orthodox. These views are appropriate to the manuscript in which the "Discourse" is found, a *silva rerum,* or copy book, presumed to belong to Mikołaj Kałuszowski, a retainer and a biographer of Prince Jeremi Wiśniowiecki (Iarema Vyshnevets'kyi), the energetic exponent of unrelenting war against the rebels.[7] For the present, the identity of the author must remain the subject of speculation and further research.

The "Discourse" divides essentially into four parts. First, various manifestations and causes of hatred and conflict in the Ukrainian lands are discussed. Next the Orthodox and the schism are designated the fundamental cause of the revolt. Then the reader is reminded of the barbarous actions committed by the rebels. Finally, the words of Wiśniowiecki are quoted to convince the reader that concessions to the rebels are unthinkable and that only total suppression of the revolt and the destruction of its root causes are acceptable resolutions of the conflict.

[5] For examples of seventeenth-century political literature, see Jan Czubek, *Pisma polityczne z czasów rokoszu Zebrzydowskiego 1606–1608,* 3 vols. (Cracow, 1916–18).

[6] See Ivan Franko, "Khmel'nychchyna 1648–1649 rokiv v suchasnykh virshakh," *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* 23 (1898): 1–114.

[7] Władysław Tomkiewicz, *Jeremi Wiśniowiecki (1612–1651)* (Warsaw, 1933) (= Rozprawy Historyczne Towarzystwa Naukowego Warszawskiego, 12), p. xiii. For a description of the manuscript, which is extremely rich in materials for seventeenth-century Ukrainian history, see Stanislaus Kutrzeba, *Catalogus Codicum Manu Scriptorum Musei Principum Czartoryski Cracoviensis,* vol. 2 (Cracow, 1908–1913), pp. 324–335.

Although the author titles his work a "Discourse on the Present Cossack or Peasant War," he begins with a discussion of the history of Polish-Ruthenian relations. He asserts that from ancient times the Ruthenians harbored a hatred of the Poles, or "Lachs," so deep that they would prefer to endure the yoke of the Turk or some other tyrant rather than to live happily and tranquilly in the free Commonwealth: however, he qualifies the second part of the charge by limiting it to the Ruthenian lower classes. Historical accounts show, he says, that the Ruthenians had no regard for Christian blood, for oaths and truces, or for [their rulers'—F.S.] kinship with the kings of Poland. Instead, they had used every opportunity to gain pagan support for visiting Poland with fire and sword, although the Poles had always been able to beat off these attacks and subsequently to occupy the Ruthenians' lands. He sees the contemporary situation as one more instance of the Ruthenians' enmity toward the Lachs.

Pondering the reasons for such inveterate and mortal hatred between two Christian peoples of common language and descent, the author turns first to the influences of the Greeks on the Ruthenians. The Ruthenians assumed fickleness and inconstancy of character at the time they received the faith, rites, and blood [through intermarriage—F.S.] from the Greeks of Constantinople. These weaknesses are at the root of the present discord and violence. When the prince of Kiev, Volodimer, whose ancestors had fought frequently with the rulers of Constantinople, married a sister of the emperor, he converted to Catholicism, albeit with the ceremonies and rites of the Greek church, which at that time was still in concord with Rome. A large number of Greeks followed their lady to take advantage of Kiev's excellent location for commerce, and the ruins of the city's churches and walls bear witness to the fact that it had once been a second Constantinople. Initially the author of the "Discourse" associates the Ruthenian character with Greek influences, but later he limits these influences to Ruthenians who descend from Greeks.

The author next proposes that the Ruthenians' hatred against the Lachs originates in the Ruthenians' low cultural level. This state is manifest in their neglect of learning, except reading and writing in Ruthenian, a neglect prevailing particularly in "deeper" Rus' [presumably the Dnieper Basin—F.S.], whither come all rebellions, barbarity, and contempt for authority. Charging that the Ruthenian priests fail to exhort their flocks to live in accordance with the Lord's commandments, he emphasizes their base social origin "from the field and plough peasants" and their lack of learning. This accusation is extended to include monks, to whom the

author merely concedes rigor in fasting. As a result of this cultural inferiority, the author maintains, the Lachs' faith has taken root in Rus' and is thriving, whereas the Ruthenian faith is dying out and survives only among the peasants. As evidence of this situation, he asserts that there are no longer any princes or great lords of the Ruthenian faith. He admits that there are distinguished nobles of the Greek religion in a number of counties, but insists that his reference is to senators and great officials.

Another reason for the Ruthenians' hatred of the Lachs is that the Lachs settled in the Ruthenian territories in large numbers, prospered due to their industriousness, and assumed all noble, including senatorial, and burgher offices. This is attributable to the Lachs' superior abilities in learning and competence. Yet the Ruthenians view the situation with jealousy, and, pained by their own inabilities, wish to drive the Lachs from their land.

The author next takes up problems between landlords and peasants. He admits that abuses occur in the form of excessive financial and labor obligations, which are frequently the work of leasees, tax farmers, and estate stewards. This injustice engenders the peasants' present cruel and barbarous actions against their masters.

At this point the author addresses the problem of ascertaining the real, deeper causes of the Cossack-peasant war. The explanations usually put forward do not represent the actual state of affairs, he warns. When the Cossacks are asked what drove them to acts of such bravery and desperation, they recite a long list of the injustices perpetrated by the government's administrators of the Zaporozhian Host and by other powerful officials. These are not the real causes of the revolt, however, says the author, because the Cossacks could obtain amelioration of their grievances without resorting to arms.

The primary cause of the revolt, says the author, is the "schism" of the Ruthenians. The Orthodox bishops and clergymen are "a brood of vipers, enemies of the Fatherland, destroyers of the Commonwealth, commanders of bandits, haters of the Polish people." Because the clergy do not sit in the Senate and dietines, they bribe "factious and loquacious" men to promote the Orthodox cause at the Diets and dietines. The bribed representatives refuse to pass any law until the demands of the "schismatics" are met. These "deserters from the true faith" are motivated by the desire to win the populace's approval and to participate in the Diet without expending their own funds. By threatening the Commonwealth with the Cossack menace, they and the clergy attempt to gain by force what they could not prove by reason.

The author accuses the clergy and the proponents of Orthodoxy in the Diets and dietines of being the instigators and leaders of the Cossack revolts. God is punishing the Commonwealth, he says, for having attempted to keep the peace by granting excessive concessions to the "schismatics," including the metropolitan see of Kiev, bishoprics, and the Kiev Monastery of the Caves. As repayment, the clergy and the bribed champions of "schism" have frequently set the Cossacks against the Kingdom of Poland. Now the Cossacks, who realize that they are not the equal of the Poles in spirit, audacity, nobility of character, or bravery, and that, being rabble, they cannot hope to defeat their lords, are recruiting the Tatars against the Commonwealth's army.

There follows a long list of the rebels' barbarous acts, which, according to the author, so permanently besmirch the name of Pole that no amount of plebeian blood can atone. The ultimate indignity of the revolt is that the candidates for the Polish throne are currying the rebels' favor and recruiting them as troops. He attacks the peace party in the Commonwealth, charging that any attempt to come to an accommodation with the rebels brings ruin to the Commonwealth and that anyone who espouses such a policy is an enemy of the Fatherland. He gives authority to his opinions by quoting from a letter of Prince Jeremi Wiśniowiecki to Adam Kysil (Adam Kisiel), palatine of Bratslav [a leader of the peace party and negotiator with Khmel'nyts'kyi—F.S.].[8] Wiśniowiecki wrote that only the destruction of the rebels could bring real peace, and that a negotiated compromise would only inspire new revolts, resulting in the oppression of the nobility. Furthermore, he insisted that the rebels were unworthy of being "incorporated into the Fatherland" or of receiving any rewards.

The author says that Wiśniowiecki has made two telling points. A negotiated peace with social inferiors would indeed bring dishonor to the Polish Crown, which surrounding peoples and the Cossacks themselves had often beseeched for peace. Wiśniowiecki is also correct in predicting that such a peace would only encourage the rebels to further acts against the nobility, the Commonwealth, and the Senate. Inspired by their ancient hatred of the Lachs and their recent victories, they would mount new rebellions, massacre the nobles, and recruit the Tatars with promises of Polish military captives. The author insists that a negotiated peace would only encourage the Cossacks to break away from the Polish Crown and to form a new Cossack Commonwealth or a Ruthenian Principality, adding

[8] The full text of this letter of 21 June 1648 is published in [Michałowski] *Księga pamiętnicza,* pp. 55–56.

the intriguing aside, "which apparently someone is attempting to bring about."

As Wiśniowiecki demanded, the very name "Zaporozhian Cossack" must be obliterated. The depopulated lands that would result could be resettled, the author insists, with nobles from Masovia, Podlachia, and other regions, who could serve as a military force in the borderlands. Regardless, it would be better for the "Ukraine" [in seventeenth-century usage, essentially the Kievan palatinate—F.S.] to revert to a wilderness than for the Commonwealth to endure insolence, the shedding of blood, and the profanation of churches. Still, surely the owners of the extensive land tracts in the region would find willing settlers for the cities and the villages. Since the Ruthenian clergymen had led the Cossacks to rebel, which had been revealed by recent confessions and by the priests' leadership in the taking of cities, these "authors of disturbance and enemies of the Catholic faith" and their churches must be destroyed wherever treachery had occurred in the Ukraine and Podillia. Only Lachs should be allowed to live in the cities in the Ruthenian lands nearer Poland. Once the Cossacks are destroyed, the author concludes, Rus' will never again raise a hand against the Polish Crown.

The significance of the "Discourse" in influencing the events of 1648 is difficult to determine. We cannot know how widely it circulated. Public letters and political works of the time usually survived in several and sometimes in scores of copies. The compilers of *silvae rerum* were attentive to documents of import or interest, and more than one published work has survived only because they chose to copy it into their sturdy inscription books. Yet, the circulation or popularity of a work cannot be presumed on the uncertain factor of the number of extant copies. Hence, although the "Discourse" is known in only one copy, it may have circulated widely.

Regardless of its circulation, however, the "Discourse" is of great importance to the study of the Khmel'nyts'kyi uprising. It is a very early discussion of the revolt, probably written in the autumn of 1648 and certainly between the end of June and the end of November of that year.[9] The text reflects the views of proponents of the pro-war party in the Commonwealth. In contrast to the peace party led by Jerzy Ossoliński,

[9] Wiśniowiecki's letter was written on June 21 (see fn. 8). The election of John Casimir was on 17 November 1648. Since the author of the Discourse criticizes the activities of candidates for the kingship, it must have been written prior to or soon after the election.

grand chancellor of the Kingdom of Poland, and Adam Kysil, the pro-war party left relatively few detailed expositions of their views during the early part of the conflict, although they are known to have had a wide following among the nobility. Finally, the account is remarkably wide-ranging in its discussion of the conflicts and tensions in the Ukrainian lands, and thus provides a contemporary's detailed view of the political institutions, social groupings, and cultures of the time as they related to the revolt. In a forthcoming article in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies,* I shall examine the "Discourse" as a source to the political, social and cultural attitudes in the Commonwealth during the revolt.

Harvard University

TEXT OF DOCUMENT

Biblioteka Czartoryskich MS 1657, folios 323–24r.
[former numeration, pp. 405–407]

Dyskurs o teraźniejszej wojnie kozackiej albo chłopskiej[1]

Z dawna naród ruski zawziął immortale odium przeciwko Lachom albo Polakom i w nim aż do tego czasu per successionem uporczywie trwa i coraz za najmniejszą okazją żarzy się i umacnia tak dalece, że wolałaby Ruś (mówię o chłopstwie, quibus nulla ab alto sanguine, educatione et artibus ingenuitas et polities) iugum pati Turcarum albo innego tyrana niżeli in tam libera Republica tranquille et beate vivere. Dowodów na to nie potrzeba, gdyż dosyć obficie i dostatecznie krojnikarz nasz polski opisał, jako Rusnacy dawniejszemi czasy, zaciągając różnych pogańskich narodów—Tatarów, Wołoszy i tych, co nad Dunajem leżą—w wielkiej liczbie Polskę nawiedzając, ogniem i mieczem pustoszyli i niszczyli, żadnego względu nie mając na krew chrześcijańską, na przysięgi uczynione i przymierza, na spowinowacenie z królami polskimi—acz nie bez pomsty uchodziło im takie okrucieństwo, albowiem Polacy, skupiwszy się naprędce, zawsze ich gromili, korzyści odbierali, a potym z większym wojskiem ziemię ich najechawszy, onę osiadali.

Takiego zajątrzenia przeciwko nam, Lachom i teraz doznawamy et res est sub oculis, manus nostrae oculatae sunt, mówi stary komediant Plautus, credunt, quod vident. Przyczyny gruntownej, tak inveterati et capitalis odii między dwiema

[1] This text has been prepared for publication in accordance with the guidelines for seventeenth-century historical documents in K. Lepszy, ed., *Instrukcja wydawnicza dla zródeł historycznych od XVI do połowy XIX wieku* (Wrocław, 1953). I am grateful to my colleague Dr. Bohdan Struminsky for his help in preparing the document for publication.

narodami chrześcijańskiemi jednegoż języka, tychże przodków z trudna znaleźć, atoli tych dochodzę. Naprzód levitas et inconstantia quam simul cum religione et ritu a podobno etiam sanguine a Graecis Constantinopolitanis Rusnacy traxerunt, ex qua levitate pochodzą dissensiones, rixae, dissidia domestica, conspirationes, tandem caedes aliena a nobis sentientium aut credentium. Grecka zasię religia weszła do Rusi za czasu Włodzimierza, księcia kijowskiego, który po wielu wojnach przodków swoich z cesarzmi konstantynopolskiemi, jako historycy świadczą, wziął w małżeństwo siostrę rodzoną Bazyliusza cesarza a z nią jako w posagu drogi skarb wiary prawdziwej katolickiej, rzymskiej, jednak z ceremoniami i obrzędami greckiego kościoła, który natenczas był w zgodzie i jedności z kościołem rzymskim i najwyższym jego pasterzem albo papieżem; zaczym za nową panią naszło się wiele Greków do Kijowa, którzy widząc blisko morze a miasto barzo wczesne ad merces exportandas, tam się osadzili, zaciągając i powinnych swoich z Konstantynopola, skąd Kijów za czasem in tantam magnitudinem, opes immensas et luxum crevit, iż był jako drugi Konstantynopol, co znać i teraz po ruinach i kościołach, które w ziemi znajdują, po cerkwiach, pieczarach i wysokich troistych wałach. Lecz ta przyczyna tym tylko osobliwie służy, którzy idą per successionem ex Graecis.

Przyjdzie tedy nienawiść Rusi przeciw Lachom zwalić na ich bellicinam, ferociam immanitatem et barbariem, które grubiaństwo i dzikość ex neglectu culturae et artium ingenuarum pochodzi. Humanitas zasię et omnis polities ex literis emanat. Uznawa to pogański poeta, gdy mówi: Adde, quod ingenuas didicisse fideliter artes / Emollit vires nec sinit esse feros. W Rusi tedy, że nie masz z dawna nauk albo barzo miałkie, w czytaniu tylko samym i w pisaniu ruszczyzny, zatym też musi być w głębszej Rusi, skąd wszytkie bunty i rebelie wychodzą, grubiaństwo, okrucieństwo, wzgarda zwierzchności, wszytkie zbrodnie i łotrostwa. Popowie też, którzy by ich mieli nauczać w cerkwiach przykazania Pańskiego i do bojaźni Bożej, do cnót chrześcijańskich napominać, są prości, hrubi, nieukowie, od roli i radła chłopi. Toż może mówić o bazylitach albo czerńcach ruskich, którzy lubo to czasem postnicy bywają, jednak i ci prostacy, a musi, literarum expertes sylvicolae a Lachom w głowę nieprzyjaciele przeto iż wiara lacka krzewi się na Rusi i wszędzie ma przodek, a onych ciemnieje i gaśnie i w samych tylko chłopach zostaje, gdyż żadnego już nie masz książęcia ani wielmożnego, który by był ruskiej wiary. Jest wprawdzie po różnych powiatach zacnej szlachty religiej greckiej, lecz się tu mówi o wysokich dygnitarzach i senatorach.

Jest jeszcze i ta przyczyna nienawiści, że Lachowie barzo gęsto osiedli ruskie kraje i rozkrzewili się po wsiach i miastach, a gospodarstwo czule i pracowicie prowadząc, żyją dostatnie i nadobnie, wszytkie też urzędy, tak szlacheckie jako miejskie dla dzielności, swojej nauki, biegłości i osobliwych obyczajów odprawują, senatorskie i trybunalskie krzesła zasiadają w powiatach ruskich, na co Ruś patrząc zazdrościwym okiem a na wzgardę swoję, raczejby niesposobność, bolejąc, radzi by Lachów z swojej ziemi zbyli, gdyż im są zawsze tanquam sudes in oculo.

Musi i to przyznać, że wielką nienawiść zniecają i żarzą podatku wielkie egzakcje, roboty niezwyczajne, powołowszczyzny częste, arendy, monopolia, rogowe, kopytowe, szafowe i tym podobne ciężary, które nad nimi wymyślają panowie urzędnicy, arendarze, jurgieltnicy, ekonomowie, chcąc sobie panom swym przyczynieniem intraty na łaskę i fawor pański zarobić. Pokazało się to dowodnie teraz, gdy chłopi własnych panów okrutnie męczyli, katowali, zabijali, wyrzucając im na oczy i wymawiając krzywdy, zniewagi i przykrości, które od nich ponosili i od ich urzędników.

To namieniwszy w pospolitości, spyta się kto, co też za przyczyna teraźniejszej wojny kozackiej, chłopskiej. Nie chcę ja tu scrutari arcana consilia, altissimas cogitationes et intima veritatis penetrare adyta, gdyż veritas in Democriti puteo demersa latet, a wiele też ludzie sua solentia at ingenii ferocitate domyślają się, czego nigdy nie było, chyba imagines quaedam et simul /acra/ futurorum. Spytamy się samych kozaków, co ich na taką odwagę, śmiałość, desperację i szaleństwo wsadziło, rozumiem, że wszyscy wielki regestr podadzą krzywd, niesłusznych podatków i kontemptów, które cierpieli od komisarzów swoich i inszych dzierżawców możnych. Jednak lubo to pewna, że takie gravamina zachodziły, mogli inakszym sposobem dochodzić tego apud Rempublicam (acz tych czasów i to trudna, że nie rzekę—niepodobna), a nie zaraz ad tumultus et cruenta arma descendere.

Z daleka tedy potrzeba zasiągać przyczyny jako primum principium et originem, omnium praeteritorum tumultuum et rebellionis.

Nie szerząc się, principium primum albo przyczyna najpierwsza tumultów codziennych i wojny teraźniejszej est schisma albo odszczepieństwo Rusi przy ambicjej, a to z tej miary, ponieważ władykowie schizmatycy, także popi i czerńcy, genimina viperarum, hostes patriae, perditores Reipublicae, antesignani latronum, osores Polonae gentis, nie mogą sami przez się promovere schisma, gdyż nie zasiadają w senacie, ani na sejmikach głos mają, desertores genuinae fidei, przeto przybierają sobie et largitionibus zaciągają viros loquentes factiosos, aby oni na sejmikach, sejmach libertate oris sui et innata garriendi libidine promowowali schizmę i do żadnej rzeczy w poselskiej izbie pertinaciter nie przystępowali, aż artykuł jaki wymierzą pro schismate; co oni strenue et fideliter obeunt, wiedząc, że przez jakie contradictiones apud rudem populum clarescunt, a co największa, że stąd wielki jurgielt per contributiones mają i że ich sejm nic nie kosztuje, bo alieno sumptu et opibus, loquentia illorum et dicendi protervia sustentati. A że uznawają to viri isti loquentes factiosi, qui vocem suam et operam in quaestum locarunt, wespół z swemi duchownemi, że fakcjami nie mogliby swego przewieść, przeto Rzeczpospolitą zamieszaniem Rusi, rebelią, a mianowicie kozackim wojskiem, którego zawsze bywał numerosus exercitus, jako niedźwiedzią skórą straszą, i czego nie mogą dokazać rationibus, ha vi et armis volunt expugnare.

Naszych czasów jako często bywała wojna z kozaki, quis titulus belli? Quis ductor et autor? Kto przywódcą? Popi-odszczepieńcy, władykowie, czerńcy, owi viri loquentes factiosi, pecunia conducti et largitionibus, promotores et patroni

schismatis. Czego z wielkim żalem zażywając Rzeczpospolita a nie chcąc, aby się lała krew chrześcijańska, pozwoliła aż nazbyt schizmatykom (o co P.Bóg karze znacznie i będzie karał), oddawając cerkwie i władyctwa po katolikach-władykach schizmatykom i świeżo archimandrię kijowską i metropolię, wszytko in spem pacis et altissimarum cogitationum, o których, patrzaj sam, w liście swoim jeden eiusdem officinae figulus et omnium secretorum et arcanorum, jako się przechwala, satis thrasonice conscius, quo successu? Widzi ojczyzna et altum ingemiscit. I dla tych ci faworów et conniventiam pernitiosam Reipublicae zbezpieczniawszy, popowie, czerńcy et alii, multo aere empti, promotorowie i patroni schizmatyków wsadzali zawsze i teraz extreme wsadzili kozaków na Koronę Polską, którzy znając to dobrze, gdyż nieraz doświadczyli, że impares sunt animo, audacia, generositate, viribus Polakom i że nie mogą, bywszy chłopstwem, mancipia, a natura servi, z panami własnemi aequo Marte duellare, novo exemplo et nostra aetate inusitato i które już pójdzie in praeiudicatum na potomne lata, zaciągnęli Tatarów na wojsko nasze.

I czegoście urgentibus fatis dokazali? Jako aeternam maculam et labem, nullo unquam sanguine ignobili plebeio, rustico dolendam [delendam?], nomini Polono adsperserunt, jako sacra omnia violarunt, caedibus et cruore foedarunt, świadczą kościoły, ołtarze, groby, cymboria spustoszone i sprofanowane. Wstyd dalej i mówić. Miasta i pola, ulice i rynki, zamki i pokoje pełne krwie i trupów szlachec kich. W tej jadowitości swojej, nienawiści i zazdrości będzie się pomnażało to chłopstwo, biorąc i stąd śmiałość na Koronę Polską, że kandydatowie na królestwo faworu ich i wojska zaciągają, co i teraz się już dzieje, jeżeli temu Rzeczpospolita nie zabieży a, odważywszy się raz, pokój sobie wieczny nie uczyni.

Jakoż obviare huic malo et furorem insanientis plebis compescere? Praetendere ramum olivae? Pacem supplices postulare? Ac cernent superi indignum Polono sanguine consilium. Hostis est patriae qui sic consulit. Perire satis quam adeo infami nota inustum vivere. Mądrze i uważnie odpisał Książę Jeremi Wiśniewiecki, którego miłość przeciwko ojczyźnie, acz zawsze, jednak temi czasy iście, bo na krwawym placu inter arma et classica, pokazała się. Mądrze, mówię, i wysokim pańskim książęcym sercem odpisał J.M.P. Kisielowi, wojewodzie bracławskiemu temi słowy: "Nie mogę ja konsylia w tej mierze ganić, tylko aequissima arbitrari i one chwalić, albo /wiem/ sapientis est servire tempori, ale aby takowy z nimi traktament miała Rzeczpospolita pacyfikować, żadnego w tej mierze fundam/entu/, /tylko/ że wieczna in hoc servili pectore haerebit do dalszego swowoleństwa i rebeliej odwaga, coraz gorsza ambicja et ordinis equestris ustawiczna oppressio. Jeżeli tedy Rzeczpospolita tak enormia vulnera od tych zdrajców sobie zadane i w pamięci podobno nie zagojione twardym snem pokryje a za tą okazją na karkach z ostatnim wyniszczeniem nie zawrze traktatów wiecznych, certum est, że nic inszego sobie obiecywać nie może, tylko extremum praecipitium i zgubę. Któż bowiem in patria mógł większą wywrzeć hostilitatem, jako ci, którzy się już poganinowi zaprzedają, którzy krew szlachecką z wodą prawie temperują i custodes granic koronnych znoszą? Zaczym jeśli takowi godni być inkorporowani

in patriam i jeśli godni jej vesci beneficiis? Subsit to nie tylko stanów wszytkich, ale i W.M.M. Pana iudicio, który że te swoje zawzięte prace do takiego przywodzić raczysz śrzodku, żeby rozlaną bracie naszej krew compensari i honor patriae restitui mógł, pewienem tego."[2]

To te słowa godne pamięci nieśmiertelnej księcia J.M. Wiśniewieckiego albo raczej mym zdaniem uważne, potężne i niezbite racje, któremi ignominiosam pacem zbija i odradza. Pierwsza racja, że cum servis, mancipiis, rusticis, cum faece, plebe pokój przez traktaty zawierać, to jest pokoju od nich i miłosierdzia żebrać est nova ignominia et infamia Koronie Polskiej, u której postronne narody pokoju prosiły i sami kozacy tak często. Druga racja: Jeżeli z nimi pokój jaki taki stanie, wieczna in hoc servili pectore haerebit do dalszego swowoleństwa i rebeliej odwaga, coraz gorsza ambitio et equestris ordinis ustawiczna oppressio, Reipublicae et Senatus vilipensio et contemptus za najmniejszą okazją, o którą buntownikom i grubemu chłopstwu nie trudno. Zwłaszcza mając inveteratum odium na Lachów et animum recenti victoria elatum, podniosą znowu rebelią, skupią się, szlachtę wyścinają, na zniesienie naszego wojska Tatarów, jako niedawno, zaciągną, obiecując im zapłatę-hetmanów i żołnierzów pojmanych. Do tego żaden szlachcic nie zechce mieszkać w Ukrainie, widząc, że dostatki ich i zdrowie w ostatnim a pewnym zawsze niebezpieczeństwie. Kozacy tym bezpieczniejszy, zuchwalszy będąc, zupełnie wybiją się z poddaństwa Korony Polskiej, a sobie Rzeczpospolitą nową kozacką albo Księstwo Ruskie (którego snadź ktoś afektuje) założą.

Jakiż przedsię sposób tego pokoju ma być, podaje go w liście już pomienionym Książę J.M. Wiśniewiecki, na który każdy mądry a honor ojczyzny miłujący przypadnie: aby na karkach kozackich z ostatnim ich wyniszczeniem zawarte były wieczne traktaty, to jest żeby Korona Polska zniosła, wyniszczyła, wygładziła do szczętu kozaków, aby już więcej nie słychać było imienia kozaków zaporoskich. A jeżeli komu idzie o spustoszenie tamtych krajów, jest wiele szlachty braciej naszej na Podlaszu, w Mazowszu i innych powiatach. Tym rozdać grunty, pola i futory, aby z ich żyjąc, powinność i usługę czynili Rzeczypospolitej w każdej wojennej ekspedycjej. Nadto lepiej, że pustkami będzie Ukraina, jako przed laty była, jeśli ma Rzeczpospolita takie szkody, zniewagi, krwie szlacheckiej rozlania, kościołów sprofanowanie ustawicznie ponosić. Acz znajdą panowie, którzy tam włości i dzierżawy szerokie mają, jako i kim miasta swoje i wsi osadzać.

Więc że popi, czerńcy także, ruscy duchowni do tych buntów i rebeliej kozaków prowadzą, co z różnych konfesat wiadomo i pokazało się teraz w odebraniu niektórych miast, że popi przywódcami byli, przeto tych jako autores tumultuum, hostes religionis catholicae po wszytkiej Ukrainie i Podolu, gdzie tylko zdrada i prodycja ukazała się, wespół z cerkwiami perpetuis temporibus poznosić. W

[2] For a full text of this letter, see [Michałowski] *Księga pamiętnicza*, pp. 55–56.

miasteczkach też, które są bliższe <Ruś>[3] Polszcze, aby, ile może być, sami tylko Lachowie byli, a po wsiach Ruś.

To gdy uczyni Rzeczpospolita, mając tak wielkie wojsko, że kozaków wyniszczy i samo imię ich zagubi, pewienem tego, iż Ruś wszytka, która teraz w kozaki dufa, kozakami grozi, trzymać się będzie w powinności swojej, ani więcej ręki na Koronę Polską podniesie.

Fiat.

[3] This sentence is distorted. It seems likely that the copyist inserted the word *Ruś* unnecessarily before *Polszcze* in an anticipatory error.

REVIEW ARTICLES

The Book in Pre-Mongol Rus'

EDWARD KASINEC

KNIGA V ROSSII V XI–XIII VV. By B. V. Sapunov. Edited by *S. P. Luppov*. Leningrad: "Nauka," 1978. 229 pp. 1 ruble.

KNIGA DREVNEJ RUSI. By *N. N. Rozov*. Moscow: "Kniga," 1977. 167 pp. 80 kopecks.

In the last dozen years, Soviet scholars have established an enviable record of achievement in the study of what they term "book culture"—elsewhere called codicology—on the East Slavic territories. Their research has delved into the manuscript book's preparation, distribution, preservation, and readership. The results have been published in periodicals, miscellanies, homage volumes, monographs, facsimile editions, and bibliographical catalogues. Most of these publications bear the imprint of Moscow or Leningrad, but some have appeared in the Ukraine and in such distant parts of the USSR as Vologda and Novosibirsk.

Even a cursory reading of this literature indicates that study of the book has developed into a discipline requiring the combined skills of a paleographer, historian, and literary scholar. At the most rudimentary level, the inventories and catalogues that are being compiled inform other scholars of the holdings in various collections; on another, the results of Soviet book studies yield important information about the cultural history of all the East Slavs.

The two monographs under review here deal with the first three centuries of the book in old Rus'. Both books represent the fullest statement of the respective author's views on the book in pre-Mongol Rus', and both are the products of many years of research.

Sapunov's work is part of a multivolume series dealing with the book among the East Slavs. His thesis, stated at the outset and conclusion of the study, is that because the book preserved and spread information, its appearance in the mid-eleventh century produced a cultural "leap" (*skačok*). The author justifies—to his own satisfaction, at least—use of the term "Rossiia" in his title on the grounds

that in addition to Kiev, he deals with northern areas such as Novgorod. In his opening chapter, recounting factors that led to the destruction of Old Rus' manuscript culture, Sapunov lists fire and conscious destruction as "objective" factors and includes religious censorship among "subjective" ones.

Because of his experience in dealing with the material culture of Old Rus' at the Hermitage, Sapunov says, he is not surprised that so few manuscripts were preserved, for only a small number of artifacts (swords, helmets, icons, jewelry) from the period have survived. Since extant materials can provide only a fragmentary picture, Sapunov proposes a new method for establishing the number of books in pre-Mongol Rus'.

Before the revolution, notes Sapunov, the question of the book wealth of Old Rus' was studied by P. K. Simoni, N. K. Nikol'skii, and especially N. V. Volkov. Volkov calculated that 15,000 books and manuscripts existed in Rus' before the Mongol invasion: his figures were based on the number of manuscripts and churches that were preserved, multiplied by the number of cities in Rus'. In 1965, a catalogue published in *Arxeografičeskij ežegodnik* postulated that of the 1,296 parchment manuscripts known to have existed before the Mongol invasion, only 190 (14.7 percent) have survived as cataloguing units in Soviet repositories; these include Old Slavonic, Rus', Bulgarian, Serbian, and other manuscripts. Although Volkov's work was compiled in the previous century, it listed items that were not mentioned in the 1965 catalogue, including manuscripts in private hands that have since disappeared (p. 35). But Sapunov finds Volkov's estimates unacceptable. He maintains that Volkov underestimated the number of city churches and took no account of village churches. Sapunov himself calculates that between 130,000 and 140,000 codices in several hundred titles existed in Old Rus' (p. 82).

Based on demographic studies by Soviet scholars, Sapunov estimates that in A.D. 1200 the population of Old Rus' numbered 6,990,000. He further postulates that before the Mongol invasion approximately 1,300 to 1,500 parish churches were built in cities (pp. 53–55) and that the number of village churches was between 8,000 and 9,000. Correlating the number of churches with the size of the population, Sapunov estimated that each city parish had approximately 500 members (p. 54). In addition to the city and village churches, there existed approximately 1,000 private chapels on the estates of the wealthy, as well as 300 to 500 churches in monastic institutions (p. 63). In sum, Sapunov speculates there were 10,000 churches of various types. Having analyzed the typology of Old Rus' liturgical books, Sapunov states flatly that at least 8 titles were necessary for parish and domestic use, whereas 26 were needed in monastic and cathedral churches (p. 79). Thus, both minimal and optimal estimates can be made of the number of books available in Old Rus'. Sapunov calculates the minimal estimate (p. 82) as follows: in 54 cities, there were 264 churches, actually occupying 340 buildings; in 44 cities, there were 143 monasteries. Since each parish required 8 books and each monastery 26, one must multiply 8 x 340 church buildings (= 2,720) and 26 x 143 monasteries (= 3,718) and add the two sums (= 6,438) for the number

of books available in Old Rus'. The proportion of liturgical to edificatory and secular texts, Sapunov says, was 24:11:1, or 10,500. But because the chronicles mention only the one-third of Old Rus' churches that were built of stone, there were actually three times that number of churches, or 31,500! Obviously, Sapunov's premises are highly questionable, so the reader must view his argument with extreme caution, if not skepticism.

Parchment was inexpensive in Rus', says Sapunov, and the average rate of writing was four and a half leaves per day (p. 103), at the daily wage of one *rezana*. By the year 1100 secular persons began to work as scribes, which reflected the overall growth in literacy and the demand for manuscripts. After discussing the centers of manuscript book culture (pp. 120–38), Sapunov turns to monastic and church libraries, princely holdings, private libraries, and noteworthy bookmen. He also surveys the cultural centers of Old Rus', among them Kiev, Novgorod, and Pskov, and relates the literary contacts of Old Rus' with Byzantium, Bulgaria, the West (Bohemia, England, Scandinavia), and with Hebrew and Armenian book culture.

Sapunov defines the literate person as one who could write as well as one who could only read, and distinguishes between the two categories (p. 196). On the basis of birch bark documents and the chronicles, Sapunov maintains that at least 5 percent of the entire population of Kievan Rus' and 10 percent of Novgorod's adult population were literate. To justify this surprisingly high rate, Sapunov cites the pre-Christian history of the West Slavs, the needs of the governing elite, the absence of slavery, *dvoeverie* and civil strife, and a subsequent demand for "Orthodox" books.

Rozov's short study *Kniga Drevnej Rusi* is divided into two parts. Part one surveys two typical Old Rus' books: the translated *Izborniki* of 1073 and 1076, and the "original" *Slovo* on law and grace. In analyzing these two texts, Rozov notes that the script of the manuscript book was tied to its function, for example, the size of letters often depended on whether the book was to be read aloud. After careful study of the notations to the Ostromir Gospel and the two *Izborniki,* Rozov concludes that the scribe of the *Izbornik* of 1073 was the compiler of the 1076 text (p. 13)—a conclusion with which this reviewer finds it difficult to agree. Part one concludes with a discussion of the artistic influences on the Gospels and *čet'i* (miscellanies).

In part two, Rozov deals with the number of books available, readers and scribes, and geo-bibliography. Rozov distinguishes between two types of books in Old Rus'—service books and *čet'i*—noting, reasonably enough, that the function of a text bore upon its preservation (pp. 86–88), and that the surviving texts do provide a representative picture of service books. In addition, Rozov discusses the *čet'i,* patristic literature, and hagiographic and historiographic writings.

According to Rozov, during the tenth to thirteenth century secular people and the white clergy were more important in Rus' book culture than monks. In the

next century, however, the importance of monastic scribes increased, whereas secular scribes became more professional (cf. charts on pp. 154–57). Scribes' concluding notations on the manuscripts they produced give important data about the evolution of formularies, the structure of the work, and the differentiations in the manuscript tradition of cities like Novgorod. Rozov has many short studies on the geo-bibliography of the Old Rus' manuscript, a field of study he defines as determining on the basis of marginalia how books were moved from the place where they were written.

The monographs of Sapunov and Rozov differ greatly in methodology and achievement. Sapunov has produced a compendium of facts about the book in Old Rus'. Rozov, on the other hand, has not only mastered the available data, but has given us a thoughtful, well-written, and interpretative history. Although Rozov's work appeared more than a year before his own, Sapunov cites only one article (published in 1947) by his colleague. Rozov, on the other hand, gives a thorough critique of Sapunov's methodology and findings in earlier publications. He properly chides Sapunov (p. 79) for basing his estimate of the number of churches on the fragmentary evidence of the chronicles. Disputing Sapunov's statement that *trebniki* and *služebniki* (euchologia or ritual books) were part of the holdings of every church, Rozov points out that they were more often the possession of the individual priest (p. 80). Whereas Sapunov's understanding of the physical nature of the book in Old Rus' is faulty, Rozov properly considers only a full codex (or a fragment of at least eight leaves) to be a "book" (p. 84), and multivolume works such as *Mineja* to be one title. Rozov also provides sobering correctives to Sapunov's hyperbolic figures.

Sapunov does not give substantive replies to his critics, choosing only to dismiss them with sarcasm (pp. 74, 149) or simply ignore them. Some of his arguments, as well as his calculations, leave the reader skeptical, for example, his analogy between the preservation of objects of material culture and books. Because books were often used in religious ceremonies, they were protected and preserved in a way that helmets and armaments certainly were not. Nor can one readily accept Sapunov's argument for a high degree of literacy on the basis of birch barks: to be sure, the discovery of the birch barks was sensational, but it does not justify assumptions about the general level of literacy in Old Rus'.

Sapunov's work has an even more serious shortcoming: *Kniga v Rossii* gives the reader no sense of the growth and diversification of Old Rus' book culture from the tenth to the fourteenth century. In the absence of extensive data for this period, Sapunov has fallen into the trap of arguing by analogy to a later period (p. 101), or, even worse, of drawing on information from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century registers (pp. 69, 76). Passages where Sapunov describes West European manuscript culture are especially weak because the lack of access to the relevant scholarly literature is painfully clear: for instance, he cites his correspondence with the prominent Belgian codicologist Karl Wittek for evidence on West

European book prices (p. 109). All in all, Sapunov strives too hard to convince us that Old Rus' enjoyed a level of book culture comparable to that of Western Europe (pp. 148, 153). Regrettably, his book is also marred by a number of typographical and factual errors: for instance, Stephen of Novgorod traveled to the Byzantine Empire in 1349, not in 1386 as Sapunov writes.

University of California, Berkeley

Polish Problems in the Works of Mykhailo Drahomanov

IVAN L. RUDNYTSKY

PROBLEMY POLSKIE W TWÓRCZOŚCI MICHAŁA DRAHOMANOWA. By *Elżbieta Hornowa*. Prace Opolskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, Wydział Nauk Historyczno-Społecznych. Wrocław-Warsaw-Cracow-Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1978. 195 pp.

Elżbieta Hornowa's *Polish Problems in the Works of Mykhailo Drahomanov* is a comprehensive survey of the ideas on Poland and Polish-Ukrainian relations of the Ukrainian scholar and political thinker Mykhailo Drahomanov (1841–95); it also contains an account of Drahomanov's dealings with Poles and of Polish reactions to him. The author is uniquely qualified to undertake this study, for she is probably the foremost Drahomanov scholar in the world today. Dr. Hornowa already has to her credit two books and a series of articles on Drahomanov, some of which served as preliminary studies for the present monograph (for a bibliography of her publications, see the appendix, pp. 268–69). Hornowa is known for an unmatched mastery of the Drahomanov corpus, and this book confirms her reputation.

Study of Drahomanov is impeded by the scattered nature of his voluminous writings—scholarly, journalistic, memoiristic, and epistolary—and the lack of a collected edition of them. The book under review is based on an exhaustive use of these sources, some of which must have been difficult to find (e.g., anonymous or cryptonymous articles in obscure nineteenth-century Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian periodicals). In addition, Hornowa has drawn on Polish and Soviet archival materials, such as unpublished letters to and from Drahomanov and Austrian police reports.

Drahomanov's ideas on the Polish problem are known to anyone who has taken an interest in him as a political thinker. These ideas were formulated in one of Drahomanov's principal works, *Istoricheskaia Polsha i velikorusskaia demokratiia,* originally published in the journal *Volnoe slovo* (Geneva, 1881), of which he was editor. A book edition appeared the next year (Geneva, 1882), and the work was reprinted in volume 1 of the *Sobranie politicheskikh sochinenii M. P. Dragomanova* (2 vols., Paris, 1905–1906), edited by B. Kistiakovs'kyi. Also, several other essays by Drahomanov are devoted, wholly or in part, to Poland and Polish-Ukrainian relations. A legitimate question, then, is what new contribution does Hornowa's monograph make to Drahomanov studies?

Simply providing a handy and reliable digest of Drahomanov's known ideas would have been commendable and welcome, particularly for Polish readers whose firsthand acquaintance with Ukrainian scholarly and political literature is very often slight. But, in fact, the book has more to offer. By her judicious use of a large body of source materials, Hornowa has filled in the known contours of Drahomanov's thought with rich details. She has demonstrated that Drahomanov's ideas about Poland and Polish-Ukrainian relations were far more complex and sophisticated than even a relatively well-informed student might have assumed. Moreover, the chapter "Drahomanov in Switzerland" contains valuable new biographical data. Previous researchers of Drahomanov's life have studied it, naturally enough, within a Ukrainian and Russian context. By depicting Drahomanov's Polish connections during his years in Geneva (1876–1889), Hornowa has given his biography a new dimension and shed new light on the life of the Slavic (Russian-Polish-Ukrainian) émigré community in Switzerland during that time.

Hornowa's monograph is arranged chronologically, not by stages in Drahomanov's life, but by epochs in the history of Poland and the Ukraine. Thus, individual chapters treat Drahomanov's views about Poland and Polish-Ukrainian relations from the Middle Ages to the partitions of Poland in the late eighteenth century, from the partitions through the 1863 Polish uprising, and from the aftermath of the last insurrection until Drahomanov's death thirty years later. The initial chapters contain retrospective reflections of Drahomanov as historian and philosophical publicist. The final two chapters deal with Drahomanov's stands on contemporary issues, his personal involvements with Poles and Polish affairs, and his practical attempts to influence contemporary Polish-Ukrainian relations. There is no discontinuity, however, between the earlier and the later chapters, because in Drahomanov the thinker and the activist were fused. His vision of history was based on the principles of his democratic-federalist political philosophy, whereas his political activities were rooted in his concept of the history of the Ukraine, Eastern Europe, and the world at large.

One drawback of Hornowa's method is that in the retrospective chapters she joins statements and *obiter dicta* by Drahomanov that were often separated by years or even decades. However, this procedure is legitimized by the remarkable constancy and coherence of Drahomanov's thought. Apparently, his ideas did not change in any basic respect; through time, in response to changing circumstances, he simply provided new variations on the same themes.

Hornowa emphasizes that although Drahomanov looked at Polish problems from a Ukrainian perspective, he strove to be objective and balanced in his historical and political judgments. In discussing Polish-Ukrainian relations, he did not fault only the Poles. While he was critical of the late Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and its policy toward the Ukraine, he did not gloss over the mistakes of Ukrainian leaders (especially the Ruthenian aristocracy of the Commonwealth and later the stratum of the Cossack officers). Drahomanov sym-

pathized with the struggle of the Ukrainian Cossacks for social and national emancipation, but he did not idealize Cossack and peasant revolts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He readily admitted that despite the Commonwealth's ultimate failure, political union with Poland-Lithuania did have some benefits for the Ukrainian people, for Poland was the channel through which West European cultural values of the Renaissance and Reformation were transmitted to the Ukraine.

Drahomanov recognized Poland's right to independence, but only—a most important qualification—within ethnic boundaries. He thought, however, that an independent Polish state was likely to reappear only in the event of a major European war. In the contemporary international circumstances, he considered a Polish policy of separatism unrealistic. Therefore, in Drahomanov's view, the Poles should strive instead to improve their nation's status within the framework of the three partitioning powers. Because the majority of Poles lived under Russian domination, their future was tied to the Russian Empire. The Poles would do well, then, to ally themselves with the libertarian strivings of the other peoples of Russia, instead of cultivating an attitude of isolationism. Owing to their human resources and traditional opposition to autocracy, the Poles could make a great contribution to the cause of common freedom, whereas Poland as a nation was sure to benefit from the transformation of the Russian imperial state along democratic and federalist lines.

Drahomanov condemned unequivocally the Russification implemented in "Congress" Poland after the mid-1860s. He maintained that by such oppressive measures the tsarist government was actually playing into the hands of Prussian-German imperialism, which potentially threatened all Slavic peoples. Drahomanov openly voiced his criticism of tsarist policies toward Poland when he himself was still a Russian subject. These pronouncements on behalf of the Poles, along with other non-conformist writings and activities, brought about Drahomanov's dismissal from his teaching post at Kiev University and his subsequent exile. Hornowa comments: "The sharp criticism advanced by Drahomanov of the repressive measures which the tsarist government applied [in Poland] after the suppression of the 1863 insurrection, and his attempts to bring about a change in this state of affairs, are undoubtedly among the finest and noblest pages in his life work" (p. 106).

In discussing Polish-Ukrainian relations in the Right-Bank Ukraine (the provinces of Kiev, Volhynia, and Podolia), Drahomanov showed great interest in the Ukrainophile tendencies which, in various forms, were endemic among the Polish minority of that area. He assumed that "the further development of that trend could, in fact, lead its supporters to an abdication of Polish nationality and their merger with the Ukrainian people" (p. 69), as evidenced by the evolution of the group called *khlopomany* ("peasant lovers") of the late 1850s and early 1860s. Drahomanov did not, however, advocate a forced Ukrainization of the Polish minority. Quite to the contrary, he insisted that national minorities in the Ukraine,

including the Poles, ought to maintain their distinct identities and, after the defeat of autocracy, should be endowed with cultural autonomy. Obversely, members of the Polish and other minorities must support the Ukrainian people's struggle for social and national emancipation. In Galicia, under the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Drahomanov advocated cooperation between Ukrainian and Polish democratic forces against the province's aristocratic-clerical establishment; these ideas were adopted by his Galician disciples, who in 1890 formed the Ruthenian-Ukrainian Radical Party. At the same time, Drahomanov deprecated any accommodation with Galicia's ruling Polish landlord class, and his attitude toward the so-called New Era (a short-lived attempt at Polish-Ukrainian compromise in Galicia, initiated under conservative auspices in 1890) was wholly negative.

It may appear incongruous that the many proofs of Drahomanov's good will toward the Poles met little favor. Even socialist and populist Polish circles were suspicious of Drahomanov. He was frequently attacked in the Polish socialist press, and his personal relations with Polish exiles in Switzerland were generally strained. The explanation lies in Drahomanov's uncompromising rejection of Polish "historical" patriotism. He relentlessly combated any overt or covert Polish claims to lands of the former Commonwealth where the majority of inhabitants was non-Polish. Yet nineteenth-century Polish political thought was wedded to the concept of historical legitimism, and even democratic and socialist groups found it difficult to set aside this ideology. Left-wing Poles were annoyed with Drahomanov's exposure of their more or less unconscious "great power" complex. Also, his insistent stand on the question of frontiers, at a time when neither Poland nor the Ukraine possessed state independence, appeared idiosyncratic and nugatory.

The event in the history of Polish-Ukrainian relations that still cast a strong shadow during the 1870s and 1880s was the uprising of 1863. Drahomanov respected the heroism of the Polish insurgents, but he castigated their policies. In his judgment, the uprising was not only ill-timed, but also vitiated by its aim to restore the Commonwealth to its pre-1772 frontiers. Drahomanov never tired of pointing out that attempts to extend the uprising to the Right-Bank Ukraine were foredoomed because of the profound hostility of the Ukrainian masses to anything smacking of Polish rule, which they identified with serfdom. Drahomanov's strictures irritated his Polish contemporaries, to whom the memories of 1863 were sacred as an instance of their country's glorious struggle for freedom.

Drahomanov's critical comments about the 1863 uprising, written nearly twenty years after the event, had more than historical significance: they touched a crucial and perennial problem in the triangle of Polish-Ukrainian-Russian relations. Drahomanov's thesis, brilliantly formulated in *Historical Poland and Great Russian Democracy,* went as follows: Polish "historical" patriotism, i.e., the claim to domination over Lithuania, Belorussia, and half of the Ukraine, was harmful to the interests of both the Ukrainian and, in the long run, the Polish peoples. It created obstacles to the Ukrainian liberation movement while delaying the emancipation of the Polish people in their homeland; it engendered mutually destruc-

tive conflicts between the Poles and their immediate eastern neighbors; and it provoked a pro-Russian reaction among the Ukrainians. The only party that profited from these conflicts was Russian autocracy. In turn, the system of centralization and oppression that the tsarist regime imposed on the empire's Ukrainian, Polish, and other borderlands prevented the liberalization of Russia itself. "Great Russian democracy" (a term Drahomanov used for Russian radicals and radical groups, from Herzen, Bakunin, and Chernyshevskii to the contemporary revolutionary populists) shared with Polish "historical" patriots one common characteristic: a disregard for the rights of the "non-historical" peasant nationalities located between ethnic Russia and ethnic Poland. Russian social revolutionaries and Polish national revolutionaries dealt with each other over the heads of Ukrainians as though the latter had no voice in the shaping of their destiny. The Russian democrats' centralistic and dictatorial "Jacobin" proclivities designated them, said Drahomanov, the ideological heirs of the very imperial autocracy against which they revolted. This Polish-Ukrainian-Russian entanglement constituted the greatest threat to the prospects of liberty in Eastern Europe, as shown by the unfortunate consequences of the 1863 uprising—repression and Russification in Poland proper, increased repression of the Ukrainian national movement (the so-called Valuev ukaz of 1863), and the strengthening of reaction in Russia and the abandonment of the liberal reforms initiated after the Crimean War.

The rejection of Drahomanov's incisive critique of the 1863 uprising by Polish spokesmen proved that Polish public opinion had not digested the lesson of 1863, and that it had not cast off the anachronistic Commonwealth tradition. This presaged ill for the future course of Polish-Ukrainian relations. Also, the Russian revolutionary movement retained in its later Marxist phase the centralistic bias which Drahomanov had discerned in the Russian populists. This outlook found striking expression in Lenin's attack on Drahomanov, in connection with the latter's critical remarks about the 1863 insurrection. Lenin called Drahomanov "a Ukrainian petty bourgeois" (a term of supreme insult to Lenin) who "expressed the views of a peasant, so ignorant and sluggish, and so attached to his dung heap, that the legitimate hatred of the Polish gentry blinded him to the significance which their struggle had for all-Russian democracy" ("The Right of Nations to Self-Determination" [1914], in V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works in Three Volumes* [New York, 1967], 1:634, fn.). This statement, written in Lenin's characteristic polemical style, Hornowa mentions only in passing (p. 7); it is ritualistically cited in all references to Drahomanov in Soviet literature.

Marxist theory states that people's political behavior is motivated primarily by their economic class interests. And yet the Marxist, Lenin, abused the Ukrainian peasantry (and their advocate, Drahomanov) because they showed no desire to sacrifice their tangible class interest on the altar of "all-Russian democracy." It is also clear that Lenin's retrospective endorsement of the 1863 uprising was not motivated by any inherent regard for Poland's desire for national independence. He viewed the Polish struggle exclusively from the perspective of its significance

to "all-Russian democracy." To bolster his position, Lenin appealed to the authority of Marx and Chernyshevskii, who had given their blessings to the Polish insurrection because they expected it to trigger a revolutionary explosion in Russia. (Lenin should also have mentioned Bakunin who, in 1863, even attempted to intervene in support of the Polish uprising. His omission of Bakunin's name was hardly accidental, however; Lenin did not wish to say anything complimentary about the man who was Marx's rival within the international labor movement.) Marx and Chernyshevskii erred in their prognosis, of course. Quite to the contrary, the Polish challenge compromised the Russian reform movement of the early 1860s, and it consolidated the reactionary forces of Russian society. Marx and Chernyshevskii can be excused for their wishful thinking, for they spoke about current and open-ended developments. It is more difficult to excuse Lenin, who from the hindsight of fifty years clung to the same doctrinaire position.

Drahomanov defended an unpopular concept that ran counter to the thinking of both the Polish patriots and the Russian revolutionaries. Yet, it is incontrovertible that the 1863 uprising ended in utter failure, and that it had nefarious results for Poland, the Ukraine, and Russian democracy, as well. With respect to Polish-Ukrainian-Russian relations, Drahomanov's historical judgment was more sound than that of Marx, Lenin, or Chernyshevskii. Drahomanov was also convinced that the inflated territorial pretensions of the Poles, on the one hand, and the Jacobin character of the Russian revolutionary movement, on the other, presented a threat to his own nation, the Ukraine, and to the future chances of liberty in Eastern Europe as a whole. Whether his forebodings were justified by later events the reader himself can judge.

Hornowa does not delve into these ramifications. Indeed, she shows a certain reluctance to confront the controversial aspects of her topic, particularly whenever treatment of Polish-Ukrainian relations impinges on Russia. The factual information Hornowa gives, however, is unimpeachable at every point. Her work is distinguished by sound scholarship and, for the most part, intellectual candor; the latter quality, especially, is sorely missing in treatments of Drahomanov found in Soviet literature. Hornowa's monograph is unquestionably a lasting contribution to Drahomanov studies, to Ukrainian intellectual history, and to the study of Polish-Ukrainian relations.

University of Alberta

APPENDIX: A Bibliography of Elżbieta Hornowa's Publications

Ocena działalności Michała Dragomanowa w historiografii ukraińskiej, rosyjskiej i polskiej. Zapiski Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Opolu (hereafter *ZNWSPO*), ser. B: Studia i monografie, no. 16. Opole: 1967. 117 pp.

Ukraiński obóz postępowy i jego współpraca z polską lewicą społeczną w Galicji 1876–1895. Prace Opolskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, Wydział Nauk Historyczno-Społecznych. Wrocław-Warsaw-Cracow: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1968. 162 pp.

"Problem żydowski w twórczości Dragomanowa." *Biuletyn Żydowskiego Instytutu Historycznego* (Warsaw), 1966, no. 57, pp. 3–37.

"Głos Michała Dragomanowa przeciw rusyfikacji szkół polskich po upadku powstania styczniowego." *ZNWSPO, Pedagogika* 4 (1966): 5–23.

"Sylwetka nauczyciela polskiego na Ukrainie w połowie ubiegłego stulecia." *ZNWSPO, Pedagogika* 5 (1967): 69–75.

"Stosunki polsko-ukraińskie w Galicji w latach 1871–1875 w oświetleniu Michała Dragomanowa." In *Sprawozdania Wydziału I Opolskiego Towarystwa Przyjaciół Nauk* (Wrocław-Warsaw-Cracow-Gdańsk, 1969), pp. 73–92.

"O interpretacji działalności i poglądów Michała Dragomanowa." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 77, no. 1 (1970): 109–113.

"Ukraińskie ugrupowania polityczne w świetle dzieł Michała Dragomanowa." In *Opolskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, Wydział I, Sprawozdania z 1967–1968* (Wrocław-Warsaw-Cracow, 1970), pp. 31–41.

"Prześladowania ukraińskiej kultury przez rząd carski za panowania Aleksandra II." *ZNWSPO, Filologia rosyjska* 9 (1972): 113–30.

"Stosunki polsko-ukraińskie w Galicji w latach 1867–1870 w świetle dzieł Michała Drahomanowa." *ZNWSPO, Historia* 10 (1972): 41–63.

"Udział Polaków w Archeologicznyam Zjeździe w Kijowie w 1874 roku." *Slavia Orientalis* 22, no. 3 (1973): 345–55.

"Poglądy Michała Drahomanowa na istotę stosunków polsko-ukraińskich od czasów najdawniejszych do unii lubelskiej." *ZNWSPO, Historia* 12 (1973): 5–18.

"Stosunki polsko-ukraińskie od unii lubelskiej do unii perejasławskiej w oświetleniu Michała Dragomanowa." In *Sprawozdania Wydziału I Opolskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk* (Wrocław-Warsaw-Cracow-Gdańsk, 1974), pp. 37–42.

"Polska i Polacy w federacyjnych planach Drahomanowa." *Slavia Orientalis* 23, no. 4 (1974): 437–42.

Note: In Polish transliteration Hornowa uses either "Dragomanow" or "Drahomanow."

REVIEWS

HANDBUCH ZUR NESTORCHRONIK. Edited by *Ludolf Müller*. Volume 1: DIE NESTORCHRONIK . . . ; viii, 577 (columns) + [2] pp.; DM 78. Volume 2: TEXTKRITISCHER APPARAT ZUR NESTORCHRONIK, comp. *Leonore Scheffler*; xix, 878 pp.; DM 168. Volume 3: VOLLSTÄNDIGES WÖRTERVERZEICHNIS ZUR NESTORCHRONIK, comp. *Barbara Gröber* and *Ludolf Müller*; part 1—xxv, 1–240 pp.; part 2—pp. 241–497; DM 36 each. Forum Slavicum, vols. 48, 49, 50. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1977–1979.

Two volumes and two parts of the third volume of this projected five-volume reference on the *Povest' vremennykh let* (*PVL*) have been published to date. While critique of the third volume (i.e., the lexicon) should await publication of its last part, some evaluation can be made of the first two volumes and what they indicate about the publication.

The first volume (48 in the Forum Slavicum series) is a reprint of the 1926 edition of the *PVL* by the Belorussian linguist E. F. Karski. Müller gives no reasons for reprinting an already published version, or for selecting Karski's edition. One could quibble with the reprinting on two points: (1) it is an easy way out, that is, Müller and company did not have to make any difficult decisions concerning copy text, better readings, formal presentation of text, etc.; and (2) it lends legitimacy to a published version as a *textus receptus*, which can be hazardous for reevaluating readings. However, in order to present the evidence that volume 2 contains, the editor had to start with some accessible text. And if a published version was to be used, then Karski's was clearly the best choice, for the simple reason that he presented the Laurentian Chronicle as the copy text more accurately than any other *PVL* editor.

The second volume (49 in the series) is a critical apparatus, compiled by Leonore Scheffler, which attempts to provide every variant (with some qualifications that are described in detail in the introduction, pp. ix–xviii) in the other main witnesses. These include the Radziwiłł, Academy, Hypatian, and Khlebnikov chronicles, as well as those variants from the Pogodin copy that are not maintained in its exemplar, the Khlebnikov. Variants from the extinct Trinity Chronicle to the year 907 are given according to the notes of volume one of the first edition of *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* (*PSRL*). One wonders, however, why the

variants from T(Pr), that is, M. D. Priselkov's reconstruction of Trinity, end in the middle of the year 912, although Priselkov's reconstruction continues beyond that. Why, indeed, are the few variants from T(Pr) given at all, since Priselkov's reconstruction is hypothetical? Questionable, too, is the need to be so thorough in pointing out scribal accidentals: for example, the numerous cases where the Khlebnikov copy replaces final ъ with ь are a paleographic peculiarity that needs to be mentioned only once. More important than these few minor imperfections, however, is the convenience of having a single volume that contains all the information one needs to make detailed textual comparisons of the main witnesses to the *PVL*.

The compiler of the second volume uses an exclamation point (!) to mark off those variants that were not reported (or reported inaccurately) in volumes one and two of *PSRL*. The critical apparatus contains, by conservative estimate, about 10,000 such exclamation points, many of which concern substantive readings. In explaining the high number, it has been argued that prior editions had other principles of selection. If so, their principles were nowhere clearly stated, nor can their principles be extrapolated with any consistency from the variants reported. This fact alone indicts all previous editions of the *PVL* as unsatisfactory and unreliable. Concomitantly, one must commend the high degree of accuracy of the Scheffler apparatus, and its detailed principles of selection. Some mistakes and typographical errors do occur: for example, variant 47, 4 on page 131 should include "Ip: Tulbovъ"; in variant 47, 24 on page 133 the reading for Ip is given as *svjaščenie*, when it should be *sščenie*; and the first line of page 227 should be marked "om. X," that is, "omitted from the Khlebnikov Chronicle." But the infrequency and insignificance of such errors show that this apparatus is by far the most reliable in the reporting of both substantive readings and accidentals. One wishes only that the compiler had chosen to provide the variants in Cyrillic rather than in Latin characters.

The editor's foreword is disappointing in that it deals only with the superficial aspects of the manuscripts. For example, Müller presents a stemma for the main witnesses, but does not discuss its implications. Nor does he characterize the peculiarities of the copies or say on what basis the stemma was drawn. One hopes that these deficiencies will be remedied in the fifth volume, which is to contain the commentary.

While not a new edition, this publication is a significant advance on all previous editions, and it clearly demonstrates the need for a new critical edition of the *PVL*.

Donald Ostrowski
Harvard University

FEOFAN PROKOPOVYČ: FILOSOFS'KI TVORY V TR'OX TOMAX: PEREKLAD Z LATYNS'KOJI. Volume 1: PRO RYTORYČNE MYSTECTVO ... RIZNI SENTENCIJI. Translated and edited by *V. I. Šynkaruk, V. M. Ničyk, M. D. Rohovyč, Ju. F. Mušak, V. P. Masljuk* et al. Kiev: "Naukova dumka," 1979. 511 pp. 33 krb. 10,000 copies.

This first volume of a projected three-volume Soviet Ukrainian edition of "philosophical" writings attributed to Feofan Prokopovyč (1681?–1725) is not the definitive nor even the authoritative work that we had a right to expect. The bulk of the volume consists of a Ukrainian translation of a manuscript *De arte rhetorica* traditionally ascribed to Prokopovyč, who is supposed to have given it as a course of lectures at the Kiev Academy in 1706–1707. The *Rizni sentenciji* of the volume's title refer to the *Sententiae variae* appended to the manuscript in question (Department of Manuscripts, Central Scientific Library, Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Kiev: pressmark—letters in Cyrillic—DA/P. 418, 150 leaves), which are also printed here in Ukrainian translation and are similarly ascribed to Prokopovyč, apparently without reservation (p. 479). But the attribution of these works to Prokopovyč has never, in fact, been proved: certainly not in accordance with the criteria of a "scientific attribution" set down by P. N. Berkov, for one (see his "Ob ustanovlenii avtorstva anonimnyx i psevdonimnyx proizvedenii XVIII veka," *Russkaja literatura,* 1958, no. 2, pp. 180–89). This problem is not even alluded to in the present volume. Nor do its compilers anywhere refer to the five other manuscript copies of this *De arte rhetorica* known to exist in Soviet repositories; nor do they take the trouble either to date or to discuss the provenance of the manuscript they used (there is some evidence that it dates to not before 1731, and that, as such, it is not the earliest nor possibly even the best of the six known manuscripts of the work). Nor is the Latin original provided of the Ukrainian texts that are printed here, an omission which, of course, makes it impossible to judge the quality of the translation. In this as in other respects, the volume under review is in distinct contrast to the edition of a *De arte poetica* attributed to Prokopovyč (also without proof) that was prepared under the direction of the late I. P. Jer'omin (Jer'omin/Erëmin, ed., *Feofan Prokopovič: Sočinenija,* Moscow and Leningrad, 1961), where both a Russian translation and the original Latin of the work (from a 1786 printed edition) are provided.

In their brief preface to this volume (it is intended, evidently, also to be the preface to the succeeding volumes of the project), the editors have only this to say about the procedures that were followed in establishing their texts (pp. 8–9):

At the Kiev Mohyla Academy, as at other higher educational institutions, lectures on rhetoric, philosophy, and theology were given in Latin. Notes (*zapysy*) of the lectures made by students are exact reproductions [*sic*] of what was said by the professors as they dictated their courses. Manuscript copies of the lecture courses

given by F. Prokopovyč are no exception to this [rule]. At the same time, clearly, in such circumstances certain mistakes were always likely [to be made]: omissions, alterations of individual words, misspellings. Students often had recourse to abbreviation, [or] abridgment (writing down [only] the first and last letters of a word).

Bearing these features of a manuscript in mind, preparation of its original [text] for publication has proceeded in four basic stages. First, photocopies were made of the notes (*zapysy*) of F. Prokopovyč's lecture courses [reference is to courses in other subjects as well as in rhetoric]. Then the translators, having deciphered the Latin text, translated it into Ukrainian, at which point the remaining abbreviations were standardized and notes to the text drawn up. This translation another specialist in classical philology compared with the deciphered Latin text and with the photocopy [of the original notes] and, when necessary, corrected inaccuracies or mistakes while completing a special philological [or linguistic] revision (*special'nu movnu redakciju*). Then the texts underwent analysis and interpretation from a philosophical point of view.

It should be noted, further, that in the lengthy introduction to this volume (which, again, is evidently intended to serve as the introduction to the entire project), various works whose attribution to Prokopovyč has been questioned, if not actually disproved, are ascribed solely and unreservedly to him: e.g., the *History of Emperor Peter the Great* first published at St. Petersburg in 1773 (p. 92) and the preface to the *Naval Statute* of 1720 (p. 94). I might add that I have recently had occasion to doubt Prokopovyč's authorship—or, at a minimum, his sole authorship—of such major works as the *Duxovnyj reglament* of 1721 or the *Pravda voli monaršej* of 1722, as is explained in a forthcoming issue of the *Slavic Review* (1981). These doubts, in part based on newly discovered documentary evidence, would seem to render the problems of attribution with respect to the Prokopovyč bibliography all the more needful of discussion and proper resolution. Equally, it should be noted that the manuscript described here in passing as an "autograph work of Feofan Prokopovyč" (p. 463) was in fact printed in its entirety more than a century ago (*Čtenija v Imperatorskom obščestve istorii i drevnostej rossijskix pri Moskovskom universitete,* 1863, no. 2, v. [*Smes'*], pp. 1–16); and that, if this manuscript is indeed in Prokopovyč's hand, it is one of only two autograph manuscripts of a work of any substance by him that is known to survive.

Apart from the very serious editorial omissions and shortcomings noted, we must observe, finally, that nowhere in the present volume is an attempt made to situate this *De arte rhetorica* in its historical context. Other such works produced at the Kiev Academy; the development of rhetoric in Europe more generally; this work's likely secondary sources (one or more of the standard textbooks of rhetoric in use in contemporary Europe): none of these matters is addressed here—not in the general introduction, which instead discusses a largely spurious "philosophical" aspect of various works attributed to Prokopovyč, and not in the hundreds of

editorial notes to the works being presented, which simply identify names mentioned in the text. The implication is that we are being offered an entirely original, even unique, *Rhetorica* by an authority unrivalled in his times.

The preparation and publication of this series of academic works ascribed to Feofan Prokopovyč by such a large team of specialists (fifteen are named in the preface) enjoying ready access to all relevant manuscripts would appear to be a golden opportunity for establishing with all possible certainty both the texts of the works in question and the identity of their author (or authors). We can only hope that this opportunity for rendering such service to the study of early modern Ukrainian (and Russian) literary culture will not be completely missed.

James Cracraft
University of Illinois, Chicago

THE IMAGE OF PETER THE GREAT IN RUSSIAN FICTION. By *Xenia Gasiorowska.* Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1979. 199 pp. $27.50.

Historical novels and short stories in which Peter the Great is a character are the subject of this study by Xenia Gasiorowska. The book is a revision of her doctoral thesis, "Peter the Great in Russian Historical Novel" (by Xenia Zytomirska Grzebienowska, University of California, 1949), a fact which, for some reason, is nowhere mentioned. Gasiorowska's field of inquiry is not as large as that of E. Shmurlo's "Petr Velikii v russkoi literature," published in the *Zhurnal ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia* for July and August 1889, which treats sermons, poems, polemics, and histories from the Petrine era through the Slavophiles. (An updated, expanded and more critical version of Shmurlo's work was provided by Jurgen Hans Roetter, "Russian Attitudes toward Peter the Great and his Reforms between 1725 and 1910," Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1951.) Although Gasiorowska mentions nonfictional characterizations of Peter, she is interested in them primarily as sources for his fictional portraits. She perceptively notes which aspects of the historical accounts fiction writers gravitate towards and which they avoid. For example, she observes that the fictional works generally deal with the period up to the Battle of Poltava, say little about Peter's ostensible thrift (which memoirists made much of), and steer clear of anecdotes about his amorous adventures. The fictional image of Peter, she demonstrates, is majestic and monumental, even when less than flattering.

The first chapter, "On Genre," presents the rules for historical fiction: the author must convince the reader that his work is accurate, and so he must not contradict well-known facts; also, he must provide sufficient detail to lend an air of authenticity to his narrative. It is useful to be reminded of the conventions of the form, yet one is puzzled by Gasiorowska's normative tone. Surely, not all

modern readers are taken in by historical fiction; consequently, it is difficult to agree with her statement that "the artists' overall purpose must be that of the Moscow Art Theater: creating on stage a perfect image of reality . . ." (p. 8). One can enjoy and appreciate Walter Scott's fictions, for instance, without accepting them as true, probable, or even possible. Must we assume that authors of historical fiction were preoccupied with mirroring the past, and should we then judge them primarily by that criterion? Probably not, I submit. Thus it is impossible to second Gasiorowska's assertion that "the resemblance typical fictional characters bear to their historical prototypes varies and is in direct proportion to the artistic skill of their creators" (p. 42).

These laws of historical fiction were evidently intended by Gasiorowska to apply to works of various eras. No concerted attempt is made to distinguish the method of Soviet writers from that of the followers of Scott in the 1830s and 1840s, for example. A few features of Soviet literature are mentioned; the fat rosy baby, the prolific mothers, and the negative images of foreigners in some Soviet historical fiction are noted. But the organization of Gasiorowska's book makes it difficult for the reader to perceive such patterns. The book is ordered around the standard elements in the Petrine portrait: Peter's personality, appearance, and activities, his entourage, wives and mistresses, children, and environment. Each novel is placed into these categories, so that it is difficult to get a sense of how Tynianov's total picture differs from Merezhkovskii's, for example. There is a certain Gogolian quality in the manner in which Gasiorowska breaks up Peter's image into its component parts and then examines the fictional representation of each: his early rising, his fear of cockroaches, his habit of jotting everything down, etc. One is reminded of sections of "Nevskii prospekt" in which only parts of the human body are seen parading down the street. An attempt to pull together the disparate strings is made when Gasiorowska writes, "Pilnyak dislikes Peter as a personality; Shildkret and Kostylyov, as an autocrat; Polezhaev is primarily sorry for Alexis; in the eyes of Eustaphieve, Peter could do no wrong . . ." (pp. 165–66). However, one feels the lack of any more extensive summation.

This is a book which brings to mind interesting topics: a comparison of the fictional characterizations of Peter the First and Ivan the Terrible; the extent to which paintings and sculptures of Peter served as a model for verbal representations of him; the impression which Pilniak and Tynianov had of eighteenth-century language; the literary influence of Scott, Hugo, and Dumas on Russian historical fiction. One wishes that Gasiorowska's bibliography were more complete, so as to facilitate the exploration of such themes. Also, a better understanding of how nineteenth-century writers and our Soviet contemporaries view the Petrine era can make us more aware of our own use of clichés. For instance, when Gasiorowska concludes that Peter's amusements were "both coarse and childish," she is, perhaps unwittingly, extending the tradition of feeling superior to the eighteenth century. There are certain stock phrases and character types which still predominate in conceptions of the era. Gasiorowska names some: the old-fashioned

boyar, his enlightened son, the cynical and opportunistic clergyman who sides with Peter, the crooked and greedy bureaucrat. An analysis of these highly conventionalized images such as the one offered by Gasiorowska can help us move beyond them.

Karen Rosenberg
Williams College

Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present. Edited by *Peter J. Potichnyj.* Edmonton and Toronto: The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1980. xiv, 365 pp. $14.95 cloth; $9.95 paper.

Since the first military clash between Poland and Kievan Rus' a thousand years ago, Polish-Ukrainian relations have been in a state of almost constant turmoil. The present volume discusses various aspects of that relationship with scholarly detachment and objectivity. It consists of seventeen papers presented (with one exception) at the conference held in October 1977, on the campus of McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, sponsored jointly by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta and the Interdepartmental Committee on Communist and East European Affairs of McMaster University. The chief objective of the conference was to provide a general survey of Polish-Ukrainian relations, rather than to take an analytical approach to this manifold and controversial subject.

In the introduction, the editor, Peter J. Potichnyj, briefly outlines the main themes and summarizes individual contributions. The proceedings of the conference have been subdivided into five sections: Historical Legacy, Cultural Relations, Economic Ties and Communications, World War Two and After, and Political Problems. Obviously these arbitrary and vague divisions overlap considerably. Generally, emphasis is on the related fields of history and politics, and the best papers are those with a synthetic approach. Especially masterful are Ivan L. Rudnytsky's "Polish-Ukrainian Relations: The Burden of History," and George G. Grabowicz's "History of Polish-Ukrainian Literary Relations: A Literary and Cultural Perspective"; both combine substance with interpretation in a form readily accessible to the non-specialist.

The section on Historical Legacy includes Andrzej Kamiński's discourse on the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and its citizenry, which deals specifically with the supernational structure's relation to the Cossacks and Ruthenians, and Frank E. Sysyn's analysis of the role of national consciousness and national conflict in the Khmel'nyts'kyi movement. Both contributions present original, sophisticated judgments lucidly, as does Orest Subtelny's study of Mazepists and Stanisławists, the first Ukrainian and Polish émigrés. On the other hand, Józef Łobodowski's "A

Polish View on Polish-Ukrainian Influences" (poorly translated from the original Polish) can only be termed fragile and superficial.

Most of the other papers are on a high professional level—notably, Vasyl Markus's discussion of the religious situation of the Ukrainians in contemporary Poland and of the Poles in the Soviet Ukraine, Georges Mond's comments on Polish-Ukrainian relations as seen through Polish eyes, Borys Lewytzkyj's analysis of the political and cultural links between Poland and the Soviet Ukraine in the 1970s, and Roman Szporluk's survey of the role of the press in Polish-Ukrainian relations. On the other hand, some papers (particularly Volodymyr N. Bandera's treatise on the structure of economic interaction among neighboring nations in Eastern Europe) are perhaps too narrowly focused on special research interests to appeal to the general reader.

The section devoted to the Second World War and its aftermath contains two useful and comprehensive surveys (by Józef Lewandowski and John Basarab) of Polish historical and political writings about Polish-Ukrainian relations during that period. They are followed by Yevhen Shtendera's account (based in part on his personal experiences) of the cooperation between the Polish and Ukrainian underground movements from the spring of 1945 until the summer of 1947.

The final section of the book considers the historical and political perspectives facing Poland and the Ukraine. It opens with Hugh Seton-Watson's brief discussion of what he terms "the three-cornered relationship between Poles, Ukrainians, and Russians" (p. 297). This problem—the inescapable reality of Russia's presence in the destinies of both Poland and the Ukraine—is treated at some length by Jaroslaw Pelenski. The concluding essay, by Adam Bromke, presents an original, if controversial view on Poland and the Ukraine in an interdependent Europe. His paper—especially the suggestion that under propitious historical conditions, the Poles and the Ukrainians "ultimately . . . might have formed a single nation" (p. 328)—should spark lively debate.

While the volume has been, on the whole, carefully edited, some annoying typographical errors have occurred: e.g., the surname of Antoni B. Szcześniak (coauthor of the frequently quoted *Droga do nikąd*) and the word *województwo* are consistently misspelled. Occasionally there are errors of fact: for example, the tsarina who "did not want to destroy her father's work" mentioned in Hryhor Orlyk's memorial written in 1742 (p. 93) was obviously Empress Elizabeth (Elizaveta Petrovna), who acceded in 1741, rather than Anna Ivanovna, who died in 1740.

In spite of these minor flaws and, as the editor himself readily admits, "somewhat uneven" content (p. v), this is a useful and valuable publication. An especially commendable feature is its refreshing candor. Most of the authors ask important questions and attempt to answer them frankly; at the same time, none tries, to use Andrzej Kamiński's apt phrase, to "light the usual conventional candle in the shrine of fine-sounding clichés and banalities" (p. 52). This volume testifies not

only to the quality of the papers presented at McMaster University, but also to the value of the contacts and exchange of ideas that such gatherings engender.

Bohdan Budurowycz
University of Toronto

THE SOVIETIZATION OF UKRAINE, 1917–1923: THE COMMUNIST DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE OF NATIONAL SELF-DETERMINATION. By *Jurij Borys.* Revised edition. Edmonton: The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1980. 488 pp. $19.95 cloth; $12.95 paper.

Twenty years are time enough to evaluate a book's importance. Originally published in Stockholm in 1960 under the title *The Russian Communist Party and the Sovietization of Ukraine,* Jurij Borys's work continues to be highly valued in the West (even in Japan). It has become one of the most important works on this period of Ukrainian history, alongside those of Dmytryshyn, Luckyj, and Sullivant.

Since 1960, many works on the revolutionary period have been published in the Soviet Union and the West. Some—such as those of M. I. Kulichenko and I. P. Kuras in the Soviet Union and those of P. Borowsky and F. Silnitski in the West—are more detailed and more successful in some aspects than Borys's work. Still, his book has retained its value, and the publication of this revised edition was a judicious undertaking.

The more the study of Stalinism progresses, the more important the study of the Leninist period becomes, regardless of whether continuity between the two periods is sought. One of the strengths of Borys's book is its extensive documentation from both Soviet and non-Soviet sources, which provides a comprehensive background to this complex period in Ukrainian history.

Borys's originality lies in his emphasis on sociological and economic elements. His description of the socioeconomic environment of the Ukraine in chapter 2, as well as the section on "Soviet Power and the Ukrainian Peasantry," are excellent. In 1917 to 1923, nationality problems in the Ukraine were tied with the peasantry. Borys successfully deals with the combined peasant-nationality problem, and he discusses agrarian policy in detail. One omission, however, is any reference to the famine that swept the Ukrainian lands in 1921–1922. The extreme food shortage was caused largely by the policies of the Soviets, so it, like the famine of 1933, was "artificial"—the result of a confrontation between the Soviet state and the Ukrainian peasantry. As such, it deserved some mention.

The second edition does not differ greatly from the first, although the work has been revised stylistically and chapters have been reorganized. The section on political parties in the Ukraine is said to have been updated by the author's more recent study, but it shows no major change.

Although it is very gratifying to see the second edition of his pioneering and unique study in print, it would be more gratifying to see a new book by Borys. Let us hope that another work by this scholar of Ukrainian history will appear soon.

Kazuo Nakai
University of Tokyo

SPRAWA UKRAIŃSKA W DRUGIEJ RZECZYPOSPOLITEJ, 1922–1926. By *Mirosława Papierzyńska-Turek*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1979. 390 pp. 70 zł., paper.

The title of this book promises much more than the author delivers. Whereas one would expect an analysis of the entire Ukrainian *sprawa* in 1922–1926, M. Papierzyńska-Turek largely confines her study to treating—very ably, however—the Ukrainian question within the confines of the battles waged in the Sejm during those years. The first third of the book details the economic, social, political, and religious background with an admirable regard for accuracy. The remainder of the study deals with the Sejm and its positions regarding the Ukrainian minority, and with the Ukrainian parliamentary representation and its political evolution.

Although this Sejm-oriented conceptual scheme allows for focusing on particular policy issues, overall it results in a skewed picture of the Ukrainian problem. First, the author has far too little to say about the Ukrainian question prior to 1922, since the elections to the Sejm were first held in November of that year. This results, for example, in her devoting much space to the Ukrainian boycott of the 1922 elections, but ignoring the equally important boycott of the 1921 census. Second, since the Eastern Galicians boycotted the parliamentary elections and were therefore unrepresented in the Sejm, Papierzyńska-Turek devotes almost the entire study to the Volhynian Ukrainian delegates. While their political importance must not be underestimated, it nevertheless remains true that the political and cultural center of interwar Ukrainian life in Poland was Lviv in particular and Eastern Galicia in general. An outgrowth of this imbalance is that the Ukrainian Orthodox Church receives far more attention than a study of the Ukrainian, and not Volhynian, question merits. Finally and most importantly, Papierzyńska-Turek's analysis of inter-Ukrainian politics tends to be mechanical and perfunctory, largely because her conceptual scheme forces strictly Ukrainian affairs to be a backdrop to the workings of the Sejm.

More annoying than such methodologically induced difficulties is the author's tendency to belittle the "bourgeois nationalist" parties and groupings, and particularly the West Ukrainian "government" (quotation marks hers) of Ievhen Petrushevych. Also severely shortchanged is the Ukrainian Military Organization (UVO), coverage of which is confined more or less to two footnotes. The reverse of this shortchanging of the Ukrainian nationalists is a disproportionately large

emphasis on the Ukrainian Communists, whom the author clearly identifies as the heroes of her narrative.

Lastly, there are the occasional factual mistakes: for example, Dmytro Dontsov was not the "founder, leader, and primary ideologue" of the Ukrainian Party of National Work—in fact, he was not even a member. Ievhen Konovalets did not "arrive" in Eastern Galicia in the autumn of 1922—rather, he left it then. One major curiosity stands out here as well as in R. Torzecki's *Kwestia ukraińska w polityce III Rzeszy*: on the basis of documents from the Polish Ministry of Internal Affairs, the two authors claim that an organization by the name of "Volia" preceded the UVO. Either all UVO memoirists have experienced a collective memory block, or the ministry simply got the story wrong—a not unlikely possibility, given the high degree of factual error encountered in English and German secret-police documents concerning the Ukrainian nationalists.

In spite of these shortcomings, Papierzyńska-Turek has written a very fine study of no small value for understanding a particular aspect of the Ukrainian problem in interwar Poland. One hopes that her next book will attempt to examine the Ukrainian question in its entirety.

Alexander J. Motyl
Columbia University

BOOKS RECEIVED

ANDERSON, Barbara A. Internal Migration During Modernization in Late Nineteenth-Century Russia. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980. xxv, 222 pp. $18.00.

BERDNYK, Oles'. Svjata Ukrajina: Eseji, lysty. Peredruk samvydavnykh tvoriv z Ukrainy. Baltimore and Toronto: Smoloskyp, 1980. 206 pp. $8.75, paper.

BOBANGO, Gerald J. The Emergence of the Romanian National State. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979. 307 pp. $17.00.

BROWN, William Edward. A History of Eighteenth Century Russian Literature. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Ardis, 1980. 659 pp. $20.00.

CARR, E. H. From Napoleon to Stalin and Other Essays. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980. ix, 276 pp. $20.00.

DEAK, Istvan. The Lawful Revolution: Louis Kossuth and the Hungarians, 1848–1849. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979. 415 pp. $16.95.

DUNMORE, Timothy. The Stalinist Command Economy: The Soviet State Apparatus and Economic Policy, 1945–1953. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980. x, 176 pp. $22.50.

European Bibliography of Soviet, East European, and Slavonic Studies. Vol. 2—1976. Birmingham, Ala.: University of Birmingham, 1979. 479 pp.

FISCHER-GALATI, Stephen, ed. The Communist Parties of Eastern Europe. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979. 393 pp. $20.00.

FOLEJEWSKI, Zbigniew, et al., eds. Canadian Contributions to the VIII International Congress of Slavists (Zagreb-Ljubljana 1978): Tradition and Innovation in Slavic Literatures, Linguistics and Stylistics. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Slavists, 1978. 194 pp.

FROJANOV, I. Ja. Kievskaja Rus': Očerki social'no-političeskoj istorii. Leningrad: Izd-vo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1980.

GARDNER, Johann von. Russian Church Singing. Vol. 1: Orthodox Worship and Hymnography. Translated by Vladimir Morosan. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980. 146 pp. $5.95, paper.

GELLNER, Ernest, ed. Soviet and Western Anthropology. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980. 285 pp. $32.50.

HRYTSIAK, Ievhen. Korotkyj zapys spohadiv: Dlja sebe samoho. Baltimore and Toronto: Smoloskyp, 1980. 117 pp. $4.75, paper.

Istorija dorevoljutsionnoj Rossii v dnevnikax i vospominanijax. Vol. 3, pt. 1: 1857–1894. Annotirovannyj ukazatel' knig i publikacij v žurnalax. Moscow: "Kniga," 1979. 379 pp. 2 roubles.

KAMENETSKY, I. Nationalism and Human Rights: Processes of Modernization in the USSR. Littleton, Colorado: 1977. Published for the Association for the Study of the Nationalities. 246 pp. $16.00.

KLEINER, Izrajil'. Nacional'ni problemy ostann'oji imperiji: Nacional'ne pytannja v SRSR očyma radjans'kyx dysydentiv. Paris, 1978. 406 pp.

KULISH, Mykola. Sonata Pathetique. Translated by George S. N. Luckyj. Littleton, Colo.: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1975. $8.50.

LINCOLN, W. Bruce. Nicholas I, Emperor and Autocrat of All the Russias. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1980. 424 pp. $7.95, paper.

LUCIUK, Lubomyr. Ukrainians in the Making: Their Kingston Story. Kingston, Ont.: The Limestone Press, 1980. x, 156 pp. $10.00.

MALLAKH, Dorothea H. El. The Slovak Autonomy Movement, 1935–1939: A Study in Unrelenting Nationalism. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979. 260 pp. $14.50.

MEDISH, Vadim. The Soviet Union. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1981. 367 pp. $9.95, paper.

MYKYTIUK, B. G. Die Ukrainischen Andreasbrauche und Verwandtes Brauchtum. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1979. 337 pp.

PELENSKI, Jaroslaw, ed. The American and European Revolutions, 1776–1848: Sociopolitical and Ideological Aspects. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1980. 424 pp. $17.50.

PLYUSHCH, L. History's Carnival: A Dissident's Autobiography. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979. 480 pp. $14.95.

RAKOWSKA-HARMSTONE, Teresa, and Andrew Gyorgy, eds. Communism in Eastern Europe. Bloomington, Ind., and London: Indiana University Press, 1979. 338 pp. $7.95.

RIGBY, T. H. Lenin's Government: Sovnarkom 1917–1922. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979. 320 pp. $37.50.

SIRKA, Ann. The Nationality Question in Austrian Education: The Case of Ukrainians in Galicia 1867–1914. Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter D. Lang, 1980. (European University Studies, Series III. History and Allied Studies, 124). 230 pp.

Sovetskoe istočnikovedenie Kievskoj Rusi: Istoriografičeskie očerki. Leningrad: "Nauka," 1979.

STROKATA, Nina. Ukrainian Women in the Soviet Union: Documented Persecution. Baltimore and Toronto: Smoloskyp, 1980. 64 pp. $3.25.

THACKERAY, Frank W. Antecedents of Revolution: Alexander I and the Polish Kingdom, 1815–1825. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980. 200 pp. $15.00.

THOMSON, Boris. Lot's Wife and the Venus of Milo. Conflicting Attitudes towards the Culture of Modern Russia. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978. 171 pp. $23.95.

VALENTA, Jiri. Soviet Intervention in Czechoslovakia, 1968: Anatomy of a Decision. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979. 208 pp. $12.95.

VOLGYES, Ivan, and Nancy Volgyes. The Liberated Female: Life, Work, and Sex in Socialist Hungary. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1977. xiv, 240 pp. $13.25.

WARE, Kallistos. The Orthodox Way. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, 1979. 195 pp. $3.95, paper.

WOODWARD, James B. Gogol's Dead Souls. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1978. 276 pp. $19.00.

ZALESKI, Eugene. Stalinist Planning for Economic Growth, 1933–1952. Translated from the French. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1980. 788 pp. $50.00.

ZLEPKO, DYMITRI. Der grosse Kosakenaufstand 1648 gegen die polnische Herrschaft. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1980. 132 pp.